

Exhibit 2

REDACTED

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE: VALSARTAN, LOSARTAN, AND : MDL NO. 2875

IRBESARTAN PRODUCTS LIABILITY :

LITIGATION, :

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ::

ALL ACTIONS

----- X

RESTRICTED CONFIDENTIAL

Veritext Virtual Zoom Videotaped deposition of RENA M. CONTI, Ph.D., taken on Friday, February 11, 2022, in Glenside, Pennsylvania, commencing at 9:04 a.m. Eastern Standard Time, before Jamie I. Moskowitz, a Certified Court Reporter and Certified Livenote Reporter.

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2 HONIK LLC</p> <p>3 BY: RUBEN HONIK, ESQUIRE ruben@honiklaw.com</p> <p>4 1515 Market Street - Suite 1100 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102</p> <p>5 267.435.1300 Counsel for the Witness Rena M. Conti, Ph.D.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 MAZIE SLATER KATZ FREEMAN BY: ADAM M. SLATER, ESQUIRE aslater@mazieslater.com 103 Eisenhower Parkway</p> <p>9 Roseland, New Jersey 07068 973.228.9898</p> <p>10 Counsel for the Plaintiffs</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 SLACK DAVIS SANGER LLP BY: JOHN R. DAVIS, ESQUIRE jdavis@slatertdavis.com</p> <p>13 6001 Bold Ruler Way - Suite 100 Austin, Texas 78746</p> <p>14 512.795.8686 Counsel for the Plaintiffs</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 LIEFF CABRASER HYMAN & BERNSTEIN, LLP BY: RACHEL J. GEMAN, ESQUIRE rgeman@lchb.com 250 Hudson Street</p> <p>18 New York, New York 10013 212.355.9500</p> <p>19 Counsel for the Plaintiffs</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 KANNER & WHITELEY, L.L.C. BY: CONLEE S. WHITELEY, ESQUIRE c.whiteley@kanner-law.com</p> <p>22 BY: DAVID J. STANOCHE, ESQUIRE d.stanoch@kanner-law.com</p> <p>23 BY: LAYNE C. HILTON, ESQUIRE lhilton@kanner-law.com</p> <p>24 701 Camp Street New Orleans, Louisiana 70130</p> <p>25 504.524.5777 Counsel for the Plaintiffs</p>	<p>Page 2</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP</p> <p>3 BY: TIFFANY M. ANDRAS, ESQUIRE andras@gtlaw.com</p> <p>4 BY: GREG E. OSTFELD, ESQUIRE ostfeldg@gtlaw.com</p> <p>5 77 West Wacker Drive - Suite 3100 Chicago, Illinois 60601</p> <p>6 312.456.1065 Counsel for Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals</p> <p>7 Industries Ltd.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP BY: ELLIE NORRIS, ESQUIRE ellie.norris@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>10 BY: D'LESLI M. DAVIS, ESQUIRE dlesli.davis@nortonrosefulbright.com</p> <p>11 2200 Ross Avenue - Suite 3600 Dallas, Texas 75201-7932</p> <p>12 214.855.8221 Counsel for McKesson Corporation</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 HUSCH BLACKWELL BY: MATTHEW D. KNEPPER, ESQUIRE matt.knepper@huschblackwell.com</p> <p>15 190 Carondelet Plaza - Suite 600 16 St. Louis, Missouri 63105 314.480.1500</p> <p>17 Counsel for the Defendant Express Scripts</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC BY: JONATHAN D. JANOW, ESQUIRE jonathan.janow@bipc.com</p> <p>20 1700 K Street - Suite 300 Washington, DC 20006</p> <p>21 202.452.7900 Counsel for the Defendant Albertsons LLC</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 4</p>
<p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2 DUANE MORRIS LLP</p> <p>3 BY: SETH A. GOLDBERG, ESQUIRE sagoldberg@duanemorris.com</p> <p>4 BY: COLEEN W. HILL, ESQUIRE cwhill@duanemorris.com</p> <p>5 BY: ALEK W. SMOLJI, ESQUIRE awsmolj@duanemorris.com</p> <p>6 BY: DANA B. KLINGES, ESQUIRE 30 South 17th Street</p> <p>7 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 215.979.1000</p> <p>8 Counsel for the Defendants Princeton Pharmaceutical Inc., Zhejiang Huahai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd, Solco Healthcare U.S., LLC and Huahai U.S., Inc.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 DUANE MORRIS LLP</p> <p>12 BY: REBECCA E. BAZAN, ESQUIRE rebazan@duanemorris.com</p> <p>13 BY: DREW T. DORNER, ESQUIRE ddorner@duanemorris.com</p> <p>14 505 9th Street NW - Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20004</p> <p>15 202.776.7800 Counsel for the Defendants Princeton Pharmaceutical Inc., Zhejiang Huahai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd, Solco Healthcare U.S., LLC and Huahai U.S., Inc.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP BY: JOHN K. GISLESON, ESQUIRE john.gisleson@morganlewis.com</p> <p>18 BY: STEVEN N. HUNCHUCK, ESQUIRE steven.hunchuck@morganlewis.com One Oxford Centre - 32nd Floor</p> <p>19 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219 412.560.3300</p> <p>20 Counsel for Defendant Aurobindo Pharma Ltd.</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 3</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES:</p> <p>2 BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC</p> <p>3 BY: CHRISTOPHER B. HENRY, ESQUIRE christopher.henry@bipc.com</p> <p>4 227 West Trade Street - Suite 600 Charlotte, North Carolina 28202</p> <p>5 704.444.3475 Counsel for the Defendant Albertsons LLC</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 BARNES & THORNBURG LLP BY: KARA M. KAPKE, ESQUIRE kara.kapke@btlaw.com 11 South Meridian Street</p> <p>9 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 317.236.1313</p> <p>10 Counsel for CVS and Rite Aid</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 CROWELL & MORING LLP BY: LUKE J. BRESNAHAN, ESQUIRE lbresnahan@crowell.com</p> <p>13 BY: DANIEL T. CAMPBELL, ESQUIRE dcampbell@crowell.com</p> <p>14 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20004</p> <p>15 202.624.2500 Counsel for the Defendant Cardinal Health Inc.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 HILL WALLACK LLP BY: WILLIAM E. MURTHA, ESQUIRE wmurtha@hillwallack.com</p> <p>18 BY: ERIC I. ABRAHAM, ESQUIRE eabraham@hillwallack.com</p> <p>19 BY: CARLO J. DEHART, ESQUIRE cdehart@hillwallack.com 21 Roszel Road</p> <p>21 Princeton, New Jersey 08540 609.924.0808</p> <p>22 Counsel for the Defendants Hetero Drugs Limited and Hetero Labs Limited</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 5</p>

2 (Pages 2 - 5)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 6	Page 8
1 A P P E A R A N C E S :		1 E X H I B I T S	Page 9
2	PIETRAGALLO GORDON ALFANO BOSICK & RASPANTI, LLP	2 EXHIBIT NUMBER	EXHIBIT NUMBER
3	BY: FRANK H. STOY, ESQUIRE	3 DESCRIPTION	DESCRIPTION
	fhss@pietragallo.com	4 PAGE	PAGE
4	38th Floor - One Oxford Centre	5 Conti 7 Retailer Damages Output	18
	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219	6 Excel Spreadsheet	
5	412.263.4397	7 Conti 8 Expert Report of Rena	208
	Counsel for the Defendants Mylan Laboratories	8 Conti, Ph.D in the Blue	
6	Limited and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.	9 Cross Blue Shield	
7		10 Association versus	
	WALSH PIZZI O'REILLY FALANGA LLP	11 GlaxoSmithKline Matter	
8	BY: CHRISTINE I. GANNON, ESQUIRE	12	
	cgannon@walshaw.com	13	
9	BY: LIZA M. WALSH, ESQUIRE	14	
	lwalsh@walshaw.com	15	
10	Three Gateway Center	16	
	100 Mulberry Street - 15th Floor	17	
11	Newark, New Jersey 07102	18	
	973. 757.1100	19	
12	Counsel for the Defendant Teva Pharmaceuticals	20	
13		21	
	HINSHAW & CULBERTSON LLP	22	
14	BY: GEOFFREY M. COAN, ESQUIRE	23	
	gcoan@hinshawlaw.com	24	
15	53 State Street - 27th Floor	25	
	Boston, Massachusetts 02109		
16	617.213.7045		
	Counsel for the Defendant Sciegen Pharmaceuticals		
17			
18	DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP		
	BY: SHEVON D. ROCKETT, ESQUIRE		
19	rockett.shevon@dorsey.com		
	51 West 52nd Street		
20	New York, New York 10019-6119		
	212.415.9357		
21	Counsel for the Defendant OptumRx		
22			
23			
24			
25			
		Page 7	Page 9
1	A P P E A R A N C E S :	1 REQUEST PAGE	
2		2	
	FALKENBERG IVES LLP	3 INSTRUCTIONS NOT TO ANSWER:	
3	BY: KIRSTIN B. IVES, ESQUIRE	4 Page Line	
	kbi@falkenbergives.com	5 None	
4	BY: MEGAN A. ZMICK, ESQUIRE	6 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS:	
	maz@falkenbergives.com	7 Page Line Description	
5	230 West Monroe - Suite 2220	8 None	
	Chicago, Illinois 60606	9 STIPULATIONS:	
6	312.566.4803	10 Page Line	
	Counsel for the Defendant Humana Pharmacy, Inc.	11 None	
7		12 QUESTIONS MARKED:	
8	ULMER & BERNE LLP	13 Page Line	
	BY: JEFFREY D. GEOPPINGER, ESQUIRE	14	
9	jgeoppinger@ulmer.com	15	
	312 Walnut Street - Suite 1400	16	
10	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-4029	17	
	513.698.5000	18	
11	Counsel for the Defendant AmerisourceBergen	19	
12	ALSO PRESENT:	20	
13	JUSTIN BILY	21	
14	Legal Videographer	22	
15		23	
16		24	
17		25	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 10		Page 12
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS		
2	RENA M. CONTI, Ph.D.		
3	Examination		
4	By Ms. Kapke.....Page 11		
5	By Mr. Campbell.....Page 100		
6	By Mr. Ostfeld.....Page 182		
7	Index of Exhibits.....Page 8		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	Page 11		
1	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 9:04.		
2	This begins Media Unit Number 1. We're back on		
3	the record.		
4	MR. GOLDBERG: Good morning, Doctor.		
5	This is Seth Goldberg, again. I'm not on		
6	video. I will be momentarily. But at this		
7	point, I'm going to pass the witness to the		
8	next questioning counsel. I am not concluding		
9	my questioning, but in the interest of time, I		
10	want to give other counsel an opportunity to		
11	ask questions.		
12	THE COURT REPORTER: Kara, you're on		
13	mute.		
14	EXAMINATION BY MS. KAPKE:		
15	Q Good morning, Dr. Conti. My name is		
16	Kara Kapke. I represent CVS and Rite Aid, and I'm		
17	going to be asking you questions primarily about		
18	your opinions vis-a-vis the retail pharmacy		
19	defendants.		
20	My first question is, do you		
21	understand that you're still under oath here today?		
22	A Yes.		
23	Q Great. Did you review any documents		
24	or materials last night or this morning before		
25	starting today's deposition?		
	Page 13		
1	currently studying, so part of my review was to get		
2	ready for my class on Monday.		
3	Q Got it. Okay.		
4	Did you -- we talked about, yesterday,		
5	you not reviewing any depositions, and I wanted to		
6	confirm that you have not reviewed any depositions		
7	of retailer pharmacy witnesses in this case; is that		
8	correct?		
9	A That's correct.		
10	Q Did you review any deposition exhibits		
11	from the depositions of the retail pharmacy 30(b)(6)		
12	witnesses?		
13	A Why don't we check my Appendix B?		
14	There's a lot of documents, so, let's just check.		
15	So there is a declaration -- so are		
16	you asking for declarations? Is that correct?		
17	Q I'm asking if you reviewed any		
18	written -- any -- strike that.		
19	I'm asking if you reviewed any		
20	deposition exhibits from the depositions of the		
21	retail pharmacy deponents.		
22	A No, I did not, not that I'm aware of.		
23	Q How about any meet and confer letters		
24	or correspondence from -- from counsel for the		
25	retail pharmacy defendants?		

4 (Pages 10 - 13)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Have you reviewed any opinions</p> <p>3 relating to discovery from Special Master</p> <p>4 Judge Vanaskie or Judge Schneider?</p> <p>5 THE COURT REPORTER: Or Judge...</p> <p>6 MS. KAPKE: Schneider.</p> <p>7 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: There's a weird echo,</p> <p>9 and I didn't hear half your sentence. I'm</p> <p>10 sorry.</p> <p>11 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>12 Q No, that's okay.</p> <p>13 Have you reviewed any opinions</p> <p>14 relating to discovery from Special Master</p> <p>15 Judge Vanaskie or Judge Schneider?</p> <p>16 A No. All I know is that I have very</p> <p>17 limited data -- limited data from the retailers.</p> <p>18 Q And you mentioned yesterday that you</p> <p>19 read one of Judge Kugler's opinions in -- in this</p> <p>20 case. What opinions of Judge Kugler's have you read</p> <p>21 for purposes of this litigation?</p> <p>22 A Just what I read to you -- you all</p> <p>23 yesterday.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Did you read the entire opinion</p> <p>25 that -- that the snippet that you read yesterday</p>	Page 14	<p>1 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry,</p> <p>2 Walgreens...</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Walgreens and the</p> <p>4 University of Chicago had a long-standing data</p> <p>5 collaborative, and I was in charge of that data</p> <p>6 collaborative. I wrote several papers with the</p> <p>7 head of public economics at Walgreens when I</p> <p>8 was faculty there.</p> <p>9 THE THE COURT REPORTER: When you were</p> <p>10 faculty there?</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: When I was faculty at</p> <p>12 the University of Chicago.</p> <p>13 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>14 Q Did you rely on the data that you</p> <p>15 reviewed in your faculty life relating to Walgreens</p> <p>16 and CVS for purposes of your opinions in this</p> <p>17 matter?</p> <p>18 A Well, so we talked about this</p> <p>19 yesterday. I primarily am a researcher, and I teach</p> <p>20 about the pharmaceutical industry. And so the</p> <p>21 papers that I wrote with Walgreens data are in my</p> <p>22 CV. They're listed. And to the extent that I know</p> <p>23 something about how these pharmacies are collecting</p> <p>24 information, what data they have on dispensing</p> <p>25 prescriptions, is -- is informed both by the work</p>	Page 16
<p>1 came from, or just a portion of it?</p> <p>2 A I read the full paragraph that that</p> <p>3 portion I read came from, but that's it.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. I -- I want to turn to your</p> <p>5 report, Conti Exhibit 5, and Attachment B, which we</p> <p>6 just talked about. And on Pages 4 to 8 of the</p> <p>7 attachment, under the heading "Electronic Data," and</p> <p>8 then the subheading, "Retailer Claims Data," you</p> <p>9 have a listing of specific documents relating to</p> <p>10 retail pharmacy defendants that you reviewed,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Is it okay if I refer to that group of</p> <p>14 data by the subheading "Retailer Claims Data"?</p> <p>15 A Sure.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. I -- I just want to make sure</p> <p>17 that you'll understand that if I'm referring to</p> <p>18 retailer claims data that that's what I'm referring</p> <p>19 to. B -- go ahead.</p> <p>20 A Okay. Yeah. Just one thing that I</p> <p>21 should tell you is that -- so in my research, I have</p> <p>22 spent a fair amount of time working with data from</p> <p>23 CVS and also from Walgreens, specifically the</p> <p>24 Walgreens -- Walgreens and the University of Chicago</p> <p>25 had --</p>	Page 15	<p>1 that I do in research, but also the work that I've</p> <p>2 done in --</p> <p>3 BY MS. KAPKE: That you've done in...</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: This particular matter.</p> <p>5 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>6 Q In terms of the actual calculations</p> <p>7 you made, not in your opinions, but the actual</p> <p>8 calculations that you made, did you rely on any of</p> <p>9 that, I'll call it faculty data, or did you solely</p> <p>10 rely on the retailer claims data?</p> <p>11 A I relied on the retailer claims data</p> <p>12 that was provided to me in this matter to do my</p> <p>13 calculation. But I have a broader understanding of</p> <p>14 what is collected by the retail pharmacies that</p> <p>15 included the ones that are named in this matter.</p> <p>16 Q Okay.</p> <p>17 A Due --</p> <p>18 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Due to the research that</p> <p>20 I have done with them.</p> <p>21 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>22 Q Understood.</p> <p>23 The documents listed here for the</p> <p>24 retailer claims data are not identified by a Bates</p> <p>25 number, but is it your understanding that the</p>	Page 17

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>Page 18</p> <p>1 documents referenced there are the documents 2 produced by the retail pharmacy defendants in this 3 litigation with Bates numbers?</p> <p>4 A That is my understanding.</p> <p>5 MS. KAPKE: I'm going to introduce, 6 and mark as Conti Exhibit 7, the retailer 7 damages output Excel spreadsheet file from the 8 materials that you provided. And it's on the 9 screen. And for the record --</p> <p>10 (Whereupon, Exhibit Conti 7 was marked 11 for Identification.)</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Can you refer me to a 13 specific one?</p> <p>14 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>15 Q I'm sorry. What?</p> <p>16 A Can you refer me to the specific 17 output that's listed on my Exhibit B?</p> <p>18 Q This is the retailer damages output 19 Excel spreadsheet that you provided.</p> <p>20 A I'm asking you, is it the backup, or 21 is it one of the documents that is listed --</p> <p>22 Q It's the backup.</p> <p>23 A -- in Exhibit B. I can't hear you.</p> <p>24 I'm sorry.</p> <p>25 Q So if you -- this is something that</p>	<p>Page 20</p> <p>1 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>2 Q So I'm marking it Conti Exhibit 7.</p> <p>3 You, in the materials provided to us, labeled it, 4 entitled it "Retailer Damages Output."</p> <p>5 A But for -- for unjust enrichment or 6 liability?</p> <p>7 Q You did not make a distinction in what 8 materials were sent to us.</p> <p>9 A I see. Well, I'm going to have to 10 double check with my staff then, please.</p> <p>11 Q What are you double checking?</p> <p>12 A Whether this is this for the liability 13 claims or for the unjust enrichment calculation.</p> <p>14 Q Is it your suggestion that you have 15 two spreadsheets -- a backup data for those?</p> <p>16 A No. As I testified yesterday, the 17 unjust enrichment and liability estimates are 18 slightly different. You can see that in my Table 2 19 and Table 3 of my report. And -- and the difference 20 is largely related to the inclusion or exclusion of 21 specific states.</p> <p>22 There is no indicator here for 23 whether -- for when the state is indicated for which 24 calculation. And so I just want to double check 25 with my staff. And I --</p>
<p>Page 19</p> <p>1 you derived, and you -- I'm -- I'm not sure I 2 understand your --</p> <p>3 A I'm asking, is this the backup that we 4 provided to you, or is it one of the documents that 5 you listed here -- I'm sorry -- that I listed here 6 in Exhibit B?</p> <p>7 Q No. This is the backup that you 8 provided to us.</p> <p>9 A Just wanted to make sure.</p> <p>10 Q Yes. And so I will represent for the 11 record that this spreadsheet has 3,741 rows, and as 12 you can see --</p> <p>13 MS. KAPKE: Maybe it can be made a 14 little bit larger.</p> <p>15 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>16 Q There are five columns across the top 17 reading retailer, entity, state, product name and 18 consumer impact. Do you --</p> <p>19 A Okay.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Can we -- can we scroll 21 all the way down so I can see -- make sure that 22 this is actually a full document, please?</p> <p>23 Keep on going. Okay. Okay. So just 24 give me a second. And this is for -- the 25 backup for which exhibit?</p>	<p>Page 21</p> <p>1 Q I'm -- and I'm sorry. I'm not trying 2 to be difficult. I just don't understand what you 3 need to double check.</p> <p>4 A All I want to know is whether this 5 backup is for the liability or for the unjust 6 enrichment calculations. That's all.</p> <p>7 You'll see there's Table 2.</p> <p>8 Q Right.</p> <p>9 A Then there's Table 3. And they 10 are -- there's two theories of liability for 11 Table 2. They differ underlying Table 2. And then 12 in Table 3, there's an unjust enrichment 13 calculation. And each one in the series of damages 14 vary slightly for the retailers, related to what 15 states are included, which are not listed here.</p> <p>16 Q Right. Let's -- we'll -- we'll get 17 to that.</p> <p>18 Was there any dispensing or 19 prescription data that went into the creation of 20 this spreadsheet besides the retailer claims data?</p> <p>21 A I don't understand your question. I'm 22 sorry.</p> <p>23 Q Was there any prescription data or 24 dispensing data or any other data that went into the 25 creation of this output file, besides what we talked</p>

6 (Pages 18 - 21)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>Page 22</p> <p>1 about earlier, being the retailer claims data?</p> <p>2 A Well, how do you define prescription</p> <p>3 data versus claims data versus dispensing data? I'm</p> <p>4 not -- I'm not familiar with those -- those are not</p> <p>5 terms of art.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. That's -- that's fair. And</p> <p>7 that's a bad question. Thank you for pointing out a</p> <p>8 bad question.</p> <p>9 I'm just trying to figure out if</p> <p>10 there's any data that you used to generate this</p> <p>11 spreadsheet besides what we talked about, being</p> <p>12 retailer claims data?</p> <p>13 A So my understanding is that the</p> <p>14 retailers provided my staff a -- data on spending by</p> <p>15 consumers for the at-issue products by state, month</p> <p>16 and year, and product -- and product subcategory,</p> <p>17 really NDC code. And that they represented, the</p> <p>18 retailers, that the dispensing fee, which I think is</p> <p>19 what you've referred to by "dispensing data," was</p> <p>20 already taken out, as was the payment made by the</p> <p>21 third-party payor --</p> <p>22 Q Okay. I --</p> <p>23 A -- for the insured prescriptions.</p> <p>24 Q I think we're talking past each other,</p> <p>25 because my -- my question just relates to, are there</p>	<p>Page 24</p> <p>1 were dispensed.</p> <p>2 All we had was the information that</p> <p>3 was provided to us.</p> <p>4 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>5 Q That's -- that's what I'm trying to --</p> <p>6 to make sure I understand.</p> <p>7 When you generated this output file,</p> <p>8 did you rely on anything other than what was</p> <p>9 provided to you?</p> <p>10 A We relied on the names and NDC codes</p> <p>11 and time periods of the at-issue valsartan and other</p> <p>12 products.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And that -- that makes sense.</p> <p>14 Am I correct that this spreadsheet was</p> <p>15 created using the SAS software?</p> <p>16 THE COURT REPORTER: Using the what?</p> <p>17 MS. KAPKE: The SAS software.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Do you mean SAS?</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Yes.</p> <p>21 A I don't know. Bennett programs in SAS</p> <p>22 and in SETA. And also, as you can see, this is an</p> <p>23 Excel file. So he may have actually done this</p> <p>24 calculation in -- in Excel.</p> <p>25 Q I want to talk about the relevant time</p>
<p>Page 23</p> <p>1 any -- any prescriptions, any fills, any -- I'm not</p> <p>2 talking about individual fees. I'm just talking</p> <p>3 about to, generate this spreadsheet, did you use any</p> <p>4 type of document other than what's in the retailer</p> <p>5 claims data?</p> <p>6 THE COURT REPORTER: Did you use any</p> <p>7 other type of...</p> <p>8 MS. KAPKE: Document.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I have -- honestly, I</p> <p>10 don't think I understand what you're saying at</p> <p>11 all. So retailer pharmacies are sitting on an</p> <p>12 incredible amount of data. So I think, you</p> <p>13 know, there's millions of transactions that are</p> <p>14 being done, all across the United States, every</p> <p>15 single day, dispensed drugs.</p> <p>16 What we were provided by the retailer</p> <p>17 pharmacies in this setting were very simple.</p> <p>18 There were co-insurance and co-payment,</p> <p>19 customer-paid amounts by product, manufacturer,</p> <p>20 month and year and state. They took out the</p> <p>21 dispensing fees, which are usually charged when</p> <p>22 a consumer goes and fills a prescription, and</p> <p>23 the retailer pharmacies also took out the</p> <p>24 payments that were made by the commercial</p> <p>25 insurers when these -- when these prescriptions</p>	<p>Page 25</p> <p>1 period used to generate this exhibit. It's my</p> <p>2 understanding, from your report, that you did not</p> <p>3 include any bills after the month of recall; is that</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A After the final month of recall for</p> <p>6 each at-issue product. That's why the name of the</p> <p>7 manufacturer and the product name at the NDC code</p> <p>8 was so critical in our analysis. And what I already</p> <p>9 mentioned, we used -- we used the date. We used the</p> <p>10 month and year, plus the manufacturer and the</p> <p>11 product name for each of our assessments.</p> <p>12 Q And for bills of Hetero NDCs, you did</p> <p>13 not include any bills before May 2018, correct?</p> <p>14 A Correct. And we stopped at</p> <p>15 August 2018.</p> <p>16 Q Logistically, how did you filter out</p> <p>17 those dates? Was that something Bennett did?</p> <p>18 A Again, retail pharmacies provided the</p> <p>19 data to us by month and year for every single</p> <p>20 product and defined by NDC code, manufacturer and</p> <p>21 state. It was the month variable that was provided</p> <p>22 to us that allowed us to filter and confine it to</p> <p>23 the specific time periods.</p> <p>24 Again, pharmacies are -- in the</p> <p>25 United States, such as the ones listed here, are</p>

7 (Pages 22 - 25)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 at-issue here, are sitting on daily transactions 2 with a -- literally with a hour, minute stamp 3 associated with them. 4 Q Okay. But -- 5 A Hold on. 6 So if -- my understanding is that the 7 information that was provided to us was aggregated 8 by the retail pharmacies themselves, up into a 9 particular time period, and then provided to us. 10 They could have given us the disaggregated data at 11 literally the minute, hour, second time period, if 12 they wanted to, so. 13 Q Okay. But that wasn't my question. 14 My question was how -- how you or your 15 staff took the retailer claims data and turned it 16 into this output file, not -- not the inceptions 17 underlying that. 18 A I answered that question. So I told 19 you we acquired information with month, year, 20 product -- product, NDC -- identified at the NDC 21 code level and the manufacturer and the state. What 22 we did was simply aggregate that information up 23 after limiting it to the relevant time period for 24 each specific product. 25 Q Let's go to your --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 that in the paragraph just referenced. 2 Q Yeah. Sorry about that. 3 A Let me just make sure I'm on the same 4 page with you. 5 Q It is on the screen now, if that's 6 helpful. 7 A Yeah. I prefer -- prefer the paper, 8 but thank you. So, right. And then there is a 9 footnote -- a footnote -- so there's a footnote that 10 ends that paragraph, which is 63. And that -- that 11 refers back to Footnote 3, as I mentioned in the 12 beginning of my report. And then in the beginning 13 of my report, I reference the complaint, and then go 14 onto reference the at-issue products. 15 Q And -- 16 A Excuse me. And their time period. 17 Q And -- and my question is, are the 18 relevant time periods the same for paragraphs 60 and 19 63? 20 A Yes. The time periods relate to the 21 sale of prescription drugs from the relevant 22 manufacturers in the relevant time period as 23 enumerated in Footnote 3 and discussed in the 24 complaint. I do not make a distinction between 25 manufacturer and retailer.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: There -- there's, like, 2 a very loud stomping, or something else, noise, 3 in the background. It's very hard to hear. It 4 sounds like it stopped now. 5 BY MS. KAPKE: 6 Q Okay. I want to go back to your 7 report, Conti Exhibit 5. In paragraph 60, you state 8 that "Expenditures by plaintiffs for the at-issue 9 valsartan products can be expressed as the product 10 of price and quantity over the relevant time period 11 of the alleged misconduct." 12 I want to ask you about the phrase 13 "time period of the alleged misconduct." What 14 misconduct are you referring to, if any, on the part 15 of the retail pharmacy defendants? 16 A What I was asked to assume and what 17 was outlined in the complaint that I reference in 18 the first couple of paragraphs of my report. 19 Q For unjust enrichment, you defined the 20 time period as each at-issue valsartan product sold 21 by the defendant retailers from January 1st, 2012 22 until the at-issue valsartan products were recalled 23 in 2018 and 2019 for being adulterated and 24 misbranded. That's in paragraph 63. 25 A Yeah. I was going to say, I don't see</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 Q Got it. 2 MS. KAPKE: Okay. I want to go back 3 to Conti Exhibit 7, the output file. 4 BY MS. KAPKE: 5 Q I think I understand what each of 6 these columns represent, but I just want to go 7 through and double check that my understanding is 8 correct. 9 So Column A is going to represent the 10 retail pharmacy defendants in this case, correct? 11 A That's what is listed, sure. 12 Q Okay. And then Column B will 13 represent the manufacturer defendants at-issue in 14 the case, which you identified through the NDC code, 15 correct? 16 A Well, it's -- it's listed from this 17 FDA recall list, the manufacturer. 18 Q Okay. To -- when you were processing 19 the retailer claims data to create this output file, 20 did you exclude any prescription fills in the 21 retailer claims data based on NDC codes? 22 A Yes, I already discussed this 23 yesterday. There were some -- we -- I was provided, 24 from attorneys, the list of manufacturers and NDC 25 codes from the FDA recall list, and then some of the</p>

8 (Pages 26 - 29)

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>Page 30</p> <p>1 NDCs were also -- that were at-issue, were 2 repackaged, relabeled or privately labeled by 3 manufacturers downstream. That happens actually 4 quite frequently in the -- in the U.S. market. We 5 picked up those NDC codes and included them here.</p> <p>6 Q Did you exclude any prescription 7 fills?</p> <p>8 A We didn't have prescription fill data.</p> <p>9 You did not -- that's not what you gave us. We had 10 aggregate sales to specific consumers, paid by 11 co-pays and co-insurance. Fills are much larger -- 12 or contain a lot more information, but you did not 13 provide that information. Fills, again, provide the 14 dispensing fee, whether or not the individual used 15 their insurance to pay for a portion or the entirety 16 of the prescription, the date, the time, of the 17 dispensing. It could include the -- the name of the 18 customer, their address, and on and on. We 19 didn't -- we didn't have that aggregate of data.</p> <p>20 You did not provide that to us.</p> <p>21 Q How much time did you spend looking at 22 the actual retailer claims data?</p> <p>23 A I spent some time with my staff.</p> <p>24 Q What does that mean?</p> <p>25 A I spent some time with my staff.</p>	<p>Page 32</p> <p>1 issue, correct?</p> <p>2 A It lists the state.</p> <p>3 Q Correct. And your report, at 4 paragraph 78 --</p> <p>5 MS. KAPKE: And we can go --</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Hold on. Hold on, 7 paragraph 78.</p> <p>8 MS. KAPKE: -- to that.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Paragraph 78. Okay.</p> <p>10 Just give me a second to read. Okay.</p> <p>11 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>12 Q It discusses how you used the state in 13 which the retail pharmacy was located for -- I 14 assume you're talking about physical brick and 15 mortar stores at that -- at that point, correct?</p> <p>16 A I'm assuming.</p> <p>17 Q And then for mail order pharmacy 18 claims, you used the state where the prescription 19 was mailed. Does that mean the state where the 20 prescription was mailed to or where it was mailed 21 from?</p> <p>22 A It was mailed to because, again, 23 injury occurs at the point of sale. So for retail 24 pharmacies, the dispensed prescription is the 25 location of the injury. And for mail order, it's</p>
<p>Page 31</p> <p>1 Q What does "some time" mean?</p> <p>2 A I spent some time over the course of 3 the time that I was working on this case. In 4 addition, I spoke with my staff on a regular basis 5 about the analysis that they were doing at my 6 direction.</p> <p>7 Q Did you --</p> <p>8 A That's kind of the normal course of 9 doing research and also working on these cases, is 10 that we look at data that was provided. We clean 11 and double check the completion of the data. We 12 look to see what fields are provided. We look to 13 see what fields were not provided that we would 14 expect to provide -- to be provided. We do some 15 double checks to make sure there's not missing data, 16 and if there is missing data, how do we think about 17 that, and on and on. That's all part of the process 18 of doing the work that I do every day.</p> <p>19 Q Did you, yourself, ever open an actual 20 spreadsheet in the retailer claims data?</p> <p>21 A No, but Bennett and the rest of my 22 staff opened it. And we discussed it at length and 23 multiple times -- and over multiple times, over the 24 time period of this analysis.</p> <p>25 Q Column C of Exhibit 7 is the state at</p>	<p>Page 33</p> <p>1 the -- where the -- the prescription was mailed to.</p> <p>2 Q How did you and your staff group 3 particular fills to particular states to derive that 4 output file?</p> <p>5 A It is contained -- the state is 6 contained in the information -- in the information 7 that the retailers provided to us.</p> <p>8 Q What did you or your staff do when the 9 Excel spreadsheet and the retailer claims data left 10 the state field blank?</p> <p>11 A I don't recall. And I don't know 12 the -- the occurrence of that. Again, I'm more than 13 happy to check with my staff.</p> <p>14 Q Well, today is my -- my opportunity to 15 depose you about the contents of your report. So 16 what did you or your staff do when an Excel 17 spreadsheet in the retailer claims data used a 18 question mark in the state field?</p> <p>19 A I'm not aware that that was -- yeah, 20 I'm not aware that that was -- that occurred at all.</p> <p>21 Q Same question if an abbreviation "AA" 22 was used in the state field?</p> <p>23 A Again, I'm not aware that that 24 occurred at all or at what frequency it occurred.</p> <p>25 If it did, my assumption is that --</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 THE THE COURT REPORTER: Is that what?</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: That it was excluded,</p> <p>3 those scripts were excluded.</p> <p>4 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>5 Q Does the abbreviation "AA" mean</p> <p>6 anything to you?</p> <p>7 A It does not, and I've never</p> <p>8 encountered it in any of the research work I've</p> <p>9 done.</p> <p>10 Q How about the abbreviation "AE"?</p> <p>11 A Same. But, again, I suspect that</p> <p>12 those were excluded for my analysis. Without a</p> <p>13 state attribution that actually means something, I</p> <p>14 don't -- I wouldn't feel comfortable including that</p> <p>15 information. I'm a little Type A about data</p> <p>16 analysis, as you probably have -- have surmised.</p> <p>17 MS. KAPKE: I want to go back to</p> <p>18 Exhibit 7.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Column D is the product name. That --</p> <p>21 the product name is just derived from the NDC --</p> <p>22 A I -- I don't know what you're talking</p> <p>23 about, and you have --</p> <p>24 Q Yeah.</p> <p>25 A Okay. Thank you.</p>	<p>Page 34</p> <p>1 was appropriate -- strike that.</p> <p>2 I want to go back and talk about when</p> <p>3 you included fills.</p> <p>4 A I don't know what you mean by "fills,"</p> <p>5 ma'am.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. That's -- that's fair. Thank</p> <p>7 you for -- for clarifying that. Did you -- I'll</p> <p>8 strike that and ask a different question.</p> <p>9 Did you ask plaintiffs' counsel</p> <p>10 whether it was appropriate to assume that the data</p> <p>11 in -- provided by the retail pharmacy defendants in</p> <p>12 the retailer claims data were actually filled at one</p> <p>13 of the defendant pharmacies?</p> <p>14 A I don't understand your question. I'm</p> <p>15 sorry.</p> <p>16 Q Did you ask plaintiffs' counsel --</p> <p>17 I'll ask it again.</p> <p>18 Did you ask plaintiffs' counsel about</p> <p>19 any limitations in the retailer claims data?</p> <p>20 A I mean, there are significant</p> <p>21 limitations in the claims data that was provided to</p> <p>22 me. So again, dispensing fees were not included.</p> <p>23 Nor were the payments made by the insurer. Nor were</p> <p>24 any information provided about whether or not these</p> <p>25 patients were insured at all. Nor was any</p>
<p>Page 35</p> <p>1 So I'm sorry. This is -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>2 I didn't hear the last -- is that -- was that a</p> <p>3 question or a statement?</p> <p>4 Q I'm just asking you to confirm that</p> <p>5 the product name is derived from the NDC code.</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And then I want to talk about</p> <p>8 Column E, the customer impact column.</p> <p>9 A That's not what it says, ma'am.</p> <p>10 Q Oh, I'm sorry. Consumer. My -- my</p> <p>11 apologies. Thank you.</p> <p>12 The consumer impact column. To derive</p> <p>13 that, you would total the full patient paid amount</p> <p>14 for each qualifying prescription for the particular</p> <p>15 retailer, manufacturer, state and script; is that</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 A Correct. And year -- and -- and time.</p> <p>18 Q And relevant time period. And that is</p> <p>19 just simple addition, correct?</p> <p>20 A So it's aggregated over quantity and</p> <p>21 paid amount.</p> <p>22 Q The -- there's -- the aggregation is</p> <p>23 just adding numbers up, correct?</p> <p>24 A Well, it's -- sure.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. I want to go back to when it</p>	<p>Page 35</p> <p>1 other -- I mean, there's -- again, retail pharmacies</p> <p>2 are sitting on tons of data that they collect when</p> <p>3 they're dispensing prescriptions. We were provided</p> <p>4 very limited data, considering the universe of data</p> <p>5 that they have registered and are required to have</p> <p>6 when they're dispensing prescription drugs in the</p> <p>7 U.S. chain.</p> <p>8 Q Did you ask plaintiffs' counsel to ask</p> <p>9 for additional data?</p> <p>10 A We had discussions about what</p> <p>11 was -- what was the data that we wanted very early</p> <p>12 on in this case, given the theories of liability and</p> <p>13 damage, which included some of the information that</p> <p>14 I provided -- I enumerated to you.</p> <p>15 Q Did you ask plaintiffs' counsel to</p> <p>16 confirm to you that the data produced by the retail</p> <p>17 pharmacy defendants in the retailer claims data only</p> <p>18 reflected prescriptions that were actually filled at</p> <p>19 a defendant pharmacy?</p> <p>20 A That was always represented to us as</p> <p>21 being provided by the retail pharmacies, that they</p> <p>22 were actually dispensed prescriptions.</p> <p>23 Q And when you say --</p> <p>24 A For the at-issue drugs in the at-issue</p> <p>25 time periods by the at-issue manufacturers. Again,</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 the retail pharmacies provided this information to 2 us. They are sitting on much more information that 3 was not provided to us. They did this cut of the 4 data, and we had to live with the cut that they 5 were -- they provided to us.</p> <p>6 Q When you say that was all that was 7 represented to us, who is the "us" in that sentence?</p> <p>8 A Myself and my staff.</p> <p>9 MS. WHITELY: Objection. Counsel, to 10 the extent that you're asking for 11 attorney/client privileged information and work 12 product information, we're objecting to that.</p> <p>13 The witness may answer.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>15 Myself and my staff.</p> <p>16 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>17 Q So who made that representation to 18 you? Was that -- and I -- I don't want to get into 19 privileged communication, but it is an assumption 20 under proving your opinion. So I want to confirm 21 whether that's an assumption that you got from 22 plaintiffs' counsel or if there's some document that 23 you read from -- from the retail pharmacy defendants 24 that confirms that.</p> <p>25 A I think we have already established</p>	<p>Page 38</p> <p>1 the date, timestamp of when that prescription 2 is actually dispensed to the consumer, there is 3 the dispensing fee. And -- and many other -- 4 there's the name of the prescribing physician 5 and their -- usually their national prescriber 6 ID number, and on and on.</p> <p>7 We were not provided that data, myself 8 and my staff.</p> <p>9 The -- my understanding is that the 10 retail pharmacies provided a very limited view 11 of the data that they have access to, that was 12 related, as we have already discussed, to 13 the -- the manufacturer name; the product name, 14 including the NDC code, the month, year and 15 state, and whether -- and whether and how much 16 the consumer paid out-of-pocket as a function 17 of co-insurance or co-payment analysis.</p> <p>18 That's all we were provided out of 19 this universe of much more data that they must 20 collect for every single dispensed prescription 21 in America.</p> <p>22 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>23 Q Were you aware of whether the retailer 24 claims data included information from PBMs?</p> <p>25 A What do you mean by that?</p>
<p>1 this, ma'am.</p> <p>2 Q I -- then -- then answer the question 3 again. I don't -- I don't know the answer.</p> <p>4 A I don't understand your question that 5 you just asked, frankly. It was a multiple, 6 compound question.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Did plaintiffs' counsel tell 8 you to assume that the retailer claims data only 9 included prescriptions that were actually filled at 10 a defendant pharmacy?</p> <p>11 MS. WHITELY: Same objection.</p> <p>12 You may answer.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I don't understand your 14 question, ma'am. I -- I know a lot about the 15 data that retail pharmacies generate when they 16 are dispensing a prescription. There is a ton 17 of data that is generated, as I have already 18 alluded to.</p> <p>19 There's the name of the consumer. 20 There's their address. There's their telephone 21 number. There is whether or not that 22 prescription is insured and by whom, by what 23 insurer. Then there is the claim amount, and 24 then there is the paid amount.</p> <p>25 And there's other information as well;</p>	<p>Page 39</p> <p>Page 41</p> <p>1 Q I'm asking if, to your knowledge, the 2 retailer claims data includes PBM customer data?</p> <p>3 A What is PBM customer data? Who is the 4 customer -- I mean, the consumer -- the patient is 5 the customer, right? They're the person who's 6 dispensed the prescription. They're the customer of 7 the pharmacy. What is PBM customer data?</p> <p>8 Q Do you understand that there 9 are -- I'll -- I'll ask a different question.</p> <p>10 Did the data you were provided include 11 prescriptions dispensed from pharmacies other than 12 the pharmacies who are defendants in this case?</p> <p>13 A I'm not sure I'm following your 14 question. I'm sorry.</p> <p>15 Q So the retailer claims data has --</p> <p>16 A Right.</p> <p>17 Q -- has data from -- that -- that 18 reflects prescription fills at those defendant 19 pharmacies, CVS, Rite Aid, other -- other defendant 20 pharmacies. Are you with me there?</p> <p>21 A I don't know -- I don't know what you 22 mean by "other defendant pharmacies." The data that 23 I have are the -- are the retailer pharmacies that 24 we reviewed when we first started talking. They're 25 listed in my Attachment B, right? We established</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 that those were the ones that were provided to me. 2 Q Right. 3 A I'm happy to go through them again. 4 So there's Albertsons, CVS, Kroger, Optum, 5 Express Scripts, Walgreens and Walmart. 6 Q Correct. Does the data in -- in the 7 retailer claims data contain information about 8 prescriptions dispensed from pharmacies who are not 9 defendants in this case? 10 A Are you asking me whether Albertsons 11 gave me data from non-Albertsons pharmacies? 12 Q In general, yes. 13 A I don't understand the question. I 14 don't understand -- I don't understand how 15 Albertsons would have data from CVS or CVS would 16 have data from Walmart or Walgreens. 17 Q Okay. 18 A I -- I mean, you know, I -- I don't 19 understand that. I'm sorry. 20 Q Okay. So -- 21 A These are massive public companies. I 22 don't see how they would have access to other public 23 companies' dispensing data at the level of 24 aggregation that we were provided. 25 Q Are you aware of the concept in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 provided to me. 2 Q I want to move now to how you used 3 Conti Exhibit 7, what you did with it. 4 Am I correct that the retailer damages 5 output file is the basis of the calculations that 6 are listed for the retail pharmacy defendants in 7 Attachments G, H and I of your report? 8 A It's the output file that corresponds 9 to the exhibits. 10 Q Okay. So let's -- let's go through 11 the -- 12 A It's not -- it's not the native data, 13 right? 14 Q Correct. 15 A And it's not the -- it's not the -- 16 it's aggregated. 17 Q Correct. 18 Okay. So let's -- I want to go 19 through Attachment -- Attachments G, H and I. So 20 let's take a look at G.1. 21 A G.1. 22 Q This the state grouping file -- 23 A Just one second. Just one second, 24 please. I'm not there yet. Okay. G.1, okay. 25 Q That's the state grouping file</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 pharmaceutical industry of a data sale from one 2 pharmacy to another? 3 A No. 4 Q Did you consider whether any of the 5 retailer claims data included within it included 6 prescription fills from non-defendant pharmacies 7 that subsequently sold their consumer data to one of 8 the defendant pharmacies? 9 A I -- I'm sorry. They may do that for 10 intelligence purposes, but I am not aware that that 11 is the data that was provided. 12 We were provided transaction data at 13 the pharmacy level. Each pharmacy has a pharmacy 14 identifier. It's standard. It's actually required 15 to be reported and kept by the regulators. And so 16 I'm assuming that the data that was provided, at 17 least the native format of the data, has that 18 pharmacy ID. 19 But, again, if the retail pharmacies 20 that -- were the ones who provided the data in the 21 form that they gave it to me, if they did not -- if 22 they mistakenly did not include their own pharmacy 23 ID or accurately counted their own pharmacy ID in 24 the data they had, that's upstream of -- there's no 25 way that I could check that in the data that was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 provided to you by plaintiffs' counsel, correct? 2 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, was 3 there an answer? 4 THE WITNESS: I said correct. 5 BY MS. KAPKE: 6 Q And you have no opinion on whether 7 these groupings are accurate, correct? 8 A What do you mean by "accurate"?</p> <p>9 MR. HONIK: Object to form and to the 10 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>11 Good morning, Kara. I apologize for 12 joining late.</p> <p>13 MS. KAPKE: No -- no worries.</p> <p>14 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>15 Q And I just want to make sure that 16 these groupings aren't a reflection of a legal 17 conclusion on your part. They're just information 18 and assumptions given to you by plaintiffs' counsel, 19 correct?</p> <p>20 MR. HONIK: Thank you.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: So in the notes of 22 Attachment G-1 -- please scroll down to the 23 next page. It states very clearly, "Retailer 24 Implied Warranty Table, provided by counsel."</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>2 Q Right. I -- I understand that it was 3 provided to you by counsel. And I just want to 4 confirm that that also means that these groupings 5 are not a reflection of any opinions that you have 6 regarding liability or state laws or legal 7 ramifications?</p> <p>8 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I'm an economist and 10 expert on the pharmaceutical industry. I'm not 11 a lawyer. I don't have an opinion about these 12 groupings. They were provided to me by 13 counsel. I think we've established that.</p> <p>14 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And the same is true for 16 Attachment H.1 and I.1 as well?</p> <p>17 A Let's look. So if you go to the next 18 page in H.1, same thing noted, "Retailer Consumer 19 Protection Act Claims Table, provided by counsel."</p> <p>20 Q So the answer to my question is yes, 21 you don't have an opinion about these groupings --</p> <p>22 A Actually, you didn't ask me a 23 question. Again, this information was provided to 24 me by counsel. I don't have a legal opinion. I'm 25 not a lawyer.</p>	Page 46	<p>1 It's -- it's explained. So in paragraphs 63 and 64, 2 I explain what I did for the defendant retailers for 3 unjust enrichment. I list, "Retailers profited from 4 the sale of at-issue valsartan products to consumers 5 at the point of sale. Profits are defined as 6 revenues minus cost for each at-issue valsartan 7 product sold by the defendant retailers from 8 January 1st until the at-issue valsartan products 9 were recalled in 2018 and 2019 for being adulterated 10 and misbranded."</p> <p>11 I then have, again, a footnote where 12 we have established which of the products at-issue 13 and at what time periods. All I did was take the 14 information that was provided to me by the at-issue 15 retailers for the relevant time periods, the 16 relevant manufacturers and the relevant product 17 categories, and matched them with the states 18 relevant for the unjust enrichment damages and 19 summed them up.</p> <p>20 I did the exact same thing for the 21 liability claims, and I think that is listed and 22 explained in my report, in the preceding section, in 23 Paragraphs 60, 61 and 62.</p> <p>24 Q And what I'm trying to -- to 25 understand and make sure that I -- I follow, is what</p>
<p>1 Q Okay. So --</p> <p>2 A And then you asked me for another 3 attachment, H.1. And then which other table?</p> <p>4 Q I.1.</p> <p>5 A I.1. So I.1, again, has the same 6 note, "Retailer Unjust Enrichment Table, provided by 7 counsel."</p> <p>8 Q So the same caveat as you made before, 9 that you don't have a legal opinion, you're not a 10 lawyer, would also apply to I.1, correct?</p> <p>11 A It's not a caveat. You asked me a 12 question, do I have a legal opinion. And I'm saying 13 I'm an economist. I'm not a lawyer. I don't have 14 an opinion on liability other than -- or the 15 inclusion, other than what was provided to me by 16 counsel to calculate.</p> <p>17 Q Right. Okay. So what I want to do is 18 make sure that I understand how you derived the 19 remainder of the Attachments to G, H and I. And 20 what I think you did to create the remainder of 21 those attachments is simply sum up the totals for 22 the relevant state and retailer found within 23 Conti Exhibit 7 where called for, according to 24 attachment G.1, H.1 or I.1.; is that correct?</p> <p>25 A Let's go back to my report and assess.</p>	Page 47	<p>1 you're doing is you're basically sorting and 2 filtering on the Excel spreadsheet that is 3 Conti Exhibit 7, correct?</p> <p>4 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Okay. So it's probably 6 easiest just to go back to the paragraph where 7 I explained the procedure again. It's in 8 paragraph 78 under, "Defendant Retailer 9 Liability Damages and Unjust Enrichment 10 Damages."</p> <p>11 So in the paragraph, I explain what we 12 did. To calculate defendant retailer theory of 13 liability damages and unjust enrichment 14 damages, I rely upon the defendant retailer 15 pharmacy claims data. These claims datasets 16 have been limited to the consumer paid amounts. 17 That is, they exclude the all third-party payor 18 amounts, and thus represent the revenues 19 described in the section previous. I already 20 provided that information.</p> <p>21 The consumer paid amounts in the 22 defendant retailer pharmacy claim datasets 23 provided to me do not include data on 24 dispensing fees, nor any of the other 25 information that I already discussed as</p>

13 (Pages 46 - 49)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 potentially relevant but not -- again, that 2 they have but was not provided to me. 3 Therefore, I don't subtract page 4 dispensing fees to offset the cost of the 5 retailer pharmacies dispensing these products 6 to consumers. This offset has already been 7 done by the defendant retailer. For each set 8 of defendant retailer pharmacy claims, I limit 9 the claims to the at-issue valsartan product 10 NDC codes found in the IQVIA dataset and 11 provided to me by counsel. 12 I then sum the total consumer paid 13 amounts by product, defendant retailer and 14 state. When there is a difference for retail 15 pharmacy claims, I use the state in which the 16 retailer pharmacy was located. For mail order 17 pharmacy claims, I use the state where the 18 prescription was mailed. 19 I then -- and then all I did was match 20 that to the states at issue for the specific 21 theory of liability, whether it be liability 1, 22 2 or unjust enrichment claims. And all they 23 are varying by is the states that are included 24 in that. It's exactly the same procedure. 25</p>	<p>Page 50</p> <p>1 data that might be -- the data that was -- that 2 underlies each one of those steps. 3 Q Is there anything that you just talked 4 about with manufacturer NDC groupings, or the 5 instructions in your report, that is not contained 6 already in Exhibit 7? 7 MR. HONIK: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What's 9 Exhibit 7? 10 BY MS. KAPKE: 11 Q The output file. 12 A There's -- that data is -- there's 13 underlying data underneath that that you would 14 probably need. 15 Q What data would you need underlying 16 the output file to create new Attachments G, H and I 17 if you were given new states at issue? 18 A You would need the data that you, the 19 retailers, provided to me. 20 Q Why? Why isn't that already addressed 21 in your output file? 22 MR. HONIK: Object to form. 23 THE WITNESS: I'm not following your 24 question. I'm sorry. 25</p>
<p>1 Q And I -- I appreciate that you're 2 trying to be helpful, but you don't need to -- to 3 read the report. What -- what I'm -- what I'm 4 trying to -- to understand is if the state groupings 5 were to change, if plaintiffs gave you a different 6 version of G.1, H.1 or I.1 with different state 7 groupings, would we need your expertise to create a 8 subsequent version of attachments G, H and I, or 9 could we do that based on what you already gave us 10 with the Conti Exhibit 7, the output file, and 11 simply sort, filter, and subtotal to create new 12 Attachments G, H and I? 13 A So my method is flexible to 14 accommodate other -- other assumptions, that 15 inclusion or exclusions of states. I think you 16 would have to go back to the data that was provided 17 to me by the retailer pharmacies and the 18 manufacturer NDC groupings where we picked up -- 19 remember, I mentioned we picked up repackager and -- 20 and private label drugs that have recast or 21 relabeled NDC codes in order to make that 22 calculation. 23 But any trained analyst could -- could 24 do that calculation, following the -- following the 25 instructions that are provided in my report and the</p>	<p>Page 51</p> <p>Page 53</p> <p>1 BY MS. KAPKE: 2 Q What I'm trying to understand is 3 say -- say we took out -- you know, we changed two 4 states in Attachment G, G.1. Why can't I go to 5 the -- the output file and just do a sort and filter 6 and then create new numbers? What -- what data are 7 you using? 8 I don't think you're using anything. 9 I think it's a simple sort and filter. And so 10 that's what I'm trying to understand. Is there 11 something you are doing or can -- can anyone do -- 12 do it once you have the output file? 13 MR. HONIK: Object to form, asked and 14 answered. 15 THE WITNESS: So, Ms. Kapke, I don't 16 feel comfortable with the idea that you just 17 sort and filter. That's not what good data 18 analysts do. They build that -- if you're 19 going to redo the calculations to -- based 20 on -- on other assumptions, good data practices 21 is to go back to the original dataset, ensure 22 the data is complete, doesn't contain any 23 mistakes, and then go through the steps again 24 to get to the calculation that's at issue. 25 I told you that the steps that we went</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 through are listed in my report. They're very 2 clear, and they're very simple. And so any 3 analyst, who is well trained, should be able to 4 follow the steps if the states change, if the 5 NDC codes change, if there are additional 6 calculations that need to get done.</p> <p>7 I would never tell, even, like, my 8 undergrads where the IT stats are to, to just 9 sort and filter to get the right -- to get a 10 different data. That is bad data management 11 practice. You go back to the original data and 12 you would calculate it.</p> <p>13 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>14 Q Okay. I'm going to move on to --</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: So actually, I'd like to 16 take a break, please. So can I have 17 five minutes?</p> <p>18 MS. KAPKE: Sure.</p> <p>19 MR. HONIK: Let's resume at 10:20.</p> <p>20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:14. 21 This ends Media Unit Number 1. We're off the 22 record.</p> <p>23 (Whereupon, a short break was taken.)</p> <p>24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:22. 25 This begins Media Unit Number 2. We're back on</p>	Page 54	<p>1 And I -- I think I get it, but I'm -- 2 I want to make sure that I do. So I want to use an 3 example to make sure that I understand. And -- and 4 if I get my example wrong, you can correct me. 5 So do you recall --</p> <p>6 A Wait. Hold on. I just want to make 7 sure that I understand. So are we focused on the 8 retailer damages, or are we focused on Table 1 where 9 the manufacturer damages is?</p> <p>10 Q I'm going to give you an example 11 that's focused on the retailer examples.</p> <p>12 A Okay. Table 2 and 3, correct?</p> <p>13 Q Yeah. I'm looking specifically at -- 14 the attachment is what I want to look at. So what I 15 want to look at is -- let's say consumer protection 16 damages for CVS for Arizona. So that's in 17 Table H.2.</p> <p>18 A Wait. Hold on. So -- so I'm on 19 Table 2 where we talk about deduplication 20 and -- okay. So --</p> <p>21 Q I want you to go to Attachment H.2.</p> <p>22 A H.2, okay.</p> <p>23 Q And you've got a calculation there for 24 consumer protection damages for CVS for Arizona -- I 25 just picked a state at random -- for [REDACTED]</p>	Page 56
<p>1 the record.</p> <p>2 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>3 Q Dr. Conti, during the break, did you 4 talk to any of your staff?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. So I'm going to ask you about 7 what you were saying regarding deduplication of 8 damages in your report. I think I understand, but I 9 want to use an example to make sure that I'm -- I'm 10 following what you're saying. So let's look --</p> <p>11 A Can you -- can you direct me -- can 12 you direct me to where in my report you're focused 13 on?</p> <p>14 Q Sure.</p> <p>15 So in your summary of damages in 16 paragraph 79, you say, "I present deduplicated 17 aggregate damages." And I'm just focused on the 18 word "deduplicated."</p> <p>19 A I don't see the -- that in paragraph 20 79. Hold on. You mean in reference to Table 1 and 21 then in reference to Table 2 and 3?</p> <p>22 Q Yes.</p> <p>23 A There are two footnotes and one 24 paragraph where deduplication is referred to.</p> <p>25 Q Right. I understand.</p>	Page 55	<p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A I see that.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And -- and that is the sum 4 total, equal to the full patient paid amount, for 5 the at-issue valsartan for the relevant time period 6 as reflected in the retailer claims data produced by 7 CVS, correct?</p> <p>8 A Under this period of damage, correct.</p> <p>9 Q Okay.</p> <p>10 A And for all of the included --</p> <p>11 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: And for all of the 13 included NDC codes and manufacturers at-issue 14 in the relevant time period.</p> <p>15 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>16 Q Got it. We're on the same page here. 17 This shouldn't be controversial, I don't think. I 18 just want to make sure that I understand.</p> <p>19 A I just want to -- I just want to make 20 sure that I understand what you're saying because 21 there's clearly been some mismatch in the language 22 that you're using as opposed to what I understand is 23 this data or these analyses.</p> <p>24 Q And please. Please always --</p> <p>25 that's -- that's one of the first things that</p>	Page 57

15 (Pages 54 - 57)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 58	Page 60
<p>1 Mr. Goldberg told you yesterday, was if you don't 2 understand a question, let us know. And -- and we 3 definitely want that.</p> <p>4 So let's go to Attachment I.2, which 5 is the unjust enrichment calculations. And the 6 total is the exact same for CVS for Arizona on 7 unjust enrichment calculations, correct?</p> <p>8 A For Arizona, yes.</p> <p>9 Q So when you talk about total damages 10 across defendant manufacturers and retailers not 11 being intended to be summed, you're not intending 12 for anyone to sum both consumer protection damages 13 and unjust enrichment damages for Arizona or CVS; is 14 that correct?</p> <p>15 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 16 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>17 But you may answer.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: So, the -- the -- that's 19 why I referred to Table 2 and Table 3, if we 20 could go back and explain the deduplication. 21 Right. So the liability damages per state and 22 per manufacturer are deduplicated. 23 So what I mean by that is, if the 24 liability damages were calculated for one 25 state, let's just say Arizona, in one theory of</p>	<p>1 conclusion. 2 You may answer. 3 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 4 Allocation and apportionment is 5 outside of the scope of my report.</p> <p>6 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>7 Q You would agree that they reflect the 8 same -- for a particular state and particular 9 manufacturer, they represent the same data which is 10 the full patient paid amount, correct?</p> <p>11 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I disagree with that 13 characterization.</p> <p>14 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>15 Q Correct it then, please.</p> <p>16 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>17 You can answer.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Okay. So let's go back 19 to the basis of liability versus unjust 20 enrichment.</p> <p>21 Liability is related to what was paid 22 at the point of sale. In this case, by the -- 23 by the consumer and TPP, if we're taking this 24 from a theoretical perspective. And so the 25 full amount of retailer liability is the -- the</p>
Page 59	Page 61
<p>1 liability, and then calculated for another -- 2 for exactly the same state, for another theory 3 of liability for retailers, they were only 4 counted once in Table 2.</p> <p>5 The unjust enrichment damages are a 6 separate calculation for every relevant state 7 manufacturer NDC code finding. So you're 8 actually comparing apples to oranges. The 9 unjust enrichment tables are their own thing. 10 And they are listed under Table 3. 11 Deduplication is referring to the liability 12 claims, and they are listed in Table 2. That's 13 why the deduplication note is referencing 14 Table 2, not Table 3.</p> <p>15 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>16 Q Are you giving an opinion that a 17 consumer plaintiff would be entitled to unjust 18 enrichment and liability damages from a retail 19 pharmacy defendant for a particular state?</p> <p>20 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can 21 I -- can I hear the end of the question, 22 please?</p> <p>23 MS. KAPKE: For a particular state.</p> <p>24 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 25 extent it requires a legal expert opinion or</p>	<p>1 full amount that -- that was paid by the 2 consumer and by the third-party payor at the 3 point of sale, and does not include offsets 4 such as rebates or discounts that might have 5 been applied later.</p> <p>6 Whereas unjust enrichment, if you go 7 to Section C of my report, paragraph 64, 8 entails understanding what the retailer profits 9 from that sale are. And that would include, 10 again, in theory, what the customer paid, what 11 the third-party payor paid, inclusive, minus 12 the retailer costs.</p> <p>13 Now, those costs, the retailers have 14 already taken out the dispensing fee, but one 15 can imagine there would be potentially other 16 costs of dispensing those specific products 17 that may be related to the point of sale, and 18 might include other offsets that could have 19 occurred.</p> <p>20 I discussed that in Footnote 84 where 21 I say, "When calculating profits, the other 22 offsets may be removed from gross profit should 23 the jury or court find these to be reasonable 24 deductions." That is relevant to unjust 25 enrichment. It's not relevant to liability.</p>

16 (Pages 58 - 61)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>2 Q In terms of the actual calculation in</p> <p>3 Attachment I --</p> <p>4 A Which -- which attachment -- which</p> <p>5 exhibit?</p> <p>6 Q I.</p> <p>7 A Right, which exhibit?</p> <p>8 Q Your report, Exhibit 5.</p> <p>9 MR. HONIK: I think there are multiple</p> <p>10 Is.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Yeah. There are</p> <p>12 multiple Is. There are -- there are -- are</p> <p>13 multiple -- there's -- I think there are five</p> <p>14 Is.</p> <p>15 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. We can pick any one of them,</p> <p>17 I.2, I.3, I --</p> <p>18 A I can't hear you. I'm sorry.</p> <p>19 Q We can just go to I.2.</p> <p>20 A Okay, I.2. Okay. That's the unjust</p> <p>21 enrichment table.</p> <p>22 Q Correct.</p> <p>23 A Right --</p> <p>24 Q It's --</p> <p>25 A Right. Which was -- which -- right?</p>	<p>Page 62</p> <p>1 there might be -- so this is the revenue paid for</p> <p>2 this specific claim, aggregated over multiple drugs,</p> <p>3 multiple --</p> <p>4 THE COURT REPORTER: Multiple what?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Manufacturers, multiple</p> <p>6 time periods.</p> <p>7 But there might be additional costs</p> <p>8 that CVS incurred in dispensing that product in</p> <p>9 a particular time period. All I have is what</p> <p>10 was paid. But from a theoretical perspective,</p> <p>11 unjust enrichment should account for the cost</p> <p>12 of dispensing that prescription, which might be</p> <p>13 captured by the dispensing fee, but might have</p> <p>14 additional costs on top of it. That's very</p> <p>15 different than the theory of liability.</p> <p>16 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>17 Q Putting aside this theoretical</p> <p>18 perspective, in terms of the actual generation of</p> <p>19 Attachment I.2, compared to the actual generation of</p> <p>20 Attachment H.2 --</p> <p>21 A Wait. Hold on. Let's go back to H.2</p> <p>22 because I'm not sure. I just want to follow along</p> <p>23 with you.</p> <p>24 Okay. So I.2 is unjust enrichment for</p> <p>25 CVS, and H.2 is liability claim for CVS. Okay.</p>
<p>1 Which is enumerated in sum in Table 3.</p> <p>2 Q Correct.</p> <p>3 In terms of the actual calculations</p> <p>4 done in Attachment I.2 --</p> <p>5 A For CVS?</p> <p>6 Q For CVS.</p> <p>7 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>8 Q It is equal to the full patient paid</p> <p>9 amount, correct?</p> <p>10 A Well, it's equal to the amount of</p> <p>11 co-insurance and co-payments. There might be other</p> <p>12 payments that were made, including a dispense fee.</p> <p>13 There might be other payments that are made or other</p> <p>14 offsets that were made. We just have what we were</p> <p>15 provided by CVS, which is the consumer co-insurance</p> <p>16 and co-payment amounts.</p> <p>17 Q If you look at the notes, if you --</p> <p>18 you reference it being equal to the full patient</p> <p>19 paid amount?</p> <p>20 A But, again, as I mentioned, there are</p> <p>21 other amounts which include the dispensing fee that</p> <p>22 consumers usually pay at the pharmacy counter.</p> <p>23 Those were taken out to arrive at these sums.</p> <p>24 And the point of unjust enrichment is</p> <p>25 that it's based on the profit that CVS made, so</p>	<p>Page 63</p> <p>Page 65</p> <p>1 Q So putting aside the theoretical</p> <p>2 perspective, the numbers generated in both H.2 and</p> <p>3 I.2 are both based on the CVS retail claims data</p> <p>4 equal to full patient paid amount?</p> <p>5 A That's correct.</p> <p>6 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>7 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>8 A So I mean, mechanically, they are the</p> <p>9 same, but theoretically, they are not the same. And</p> <p>10 so for my calculation, I only had the data that was</p> <p>11 provided to me. When -- when and if a jury finds</p> <p>12 there to be -- an award to be made, there's a</p> <p>13 different process that would go into consumers or</p> <p>14 third-party payors claiming the amount that they are</p> <p>15 owed.</p> <p>16 And that's where the theory matters</p> <p>17 because the liability amounts in the actual world</p> <p>18 are going to be related to the paid amounts.</p> <p>19 Whereas, the unjust enrichment claims would be paid</p> <p>20 amounts minus cost or revenues minus the cost of</p> <p>21 that prescription being dispensed, which might be --</p> <p>22 which might have a particular offset associated with</p> <p>23 it.</p> <p>24 Q I'm going to go back to Tables 1 and</p> <p>25 2.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 A Okay. Do you mean 2 and 3?</p> <p>2 Q No, I actually mean 1 and 2. I want</p> <p>3 to understand the interplay between Table 1, the</p> <p>4 aggregate manufacturer group damages and Table 2,</p> <p>5 the aggregate retailer damages across liability</p> <p>6 theories of damages.</p> <p>7 By necessity, any damage you've</p> <p>8 calculated in Table 2 for a retail pharmacy</p> <p>9 defendant would already be included in the</p> <p>10 manufacturer defendant calculations in Table 1,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>13 You can answer.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Are you asking me</p> <p>15 whether the IQVIA data that goes into the</p> <p>16 calculation for Table 1 would include or be</p> <p>17 inclusive of the retailer liability calculation</p> <p>18 in Table 2 for each manufacturer retailer?</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Sure. You can answer that question.</p> <p>21 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p> <p>22 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>23 Q Yeah. Please answer that question.</p> <p>24 A Yes, but not in entirety. Because,</p> <p>25 again, the retailers are only focused on the -- the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 allocation determinations? And it's good to know</p> <p>2 that you don't.</p> <p>3 A I have already testified to that -- to</p> <p>4 that three times this morning.</p> <p>5 Q I appreciate that.</p> <p>6 But -- but let's engage in a</p> <p>7 hypothetical world where the manufacturers pay all</p> <p>8 of the damages. So we're not in a -- in a world</p> <p>9 where allocation needs to be made, because the</p> <p>10 manufacturers have paid everything in the "Consumer</p> <p>11 Damages" column of Table 1. If that's the</p> <p>12 hypothetical position that you assume, are there any</p> <p>13 damages left for the retail pharmacy defendants to</p> <p>14 pay?</p> <p>15 MR. HONIK: Note my -- excuse me --</p> <p>16 note my objection on a couple of bases.</p> <p>17 Number 1, in the statement that was in</p> <p>18 your question, Kara, that confirmed at least in</p> <p>19 your question, that Dr. Conti made no</p> <p>20 allocations, that's not correct. She didn't</p> <p>21 make legal allocations, but she made lots and</p> <p>22 lots of mathematical allocations, and she spent</p> <p>23 hours talking about that. That's number 1.</p> <p>24 MS. KAPKE: Sure.</p> <p>25 MR. HONIK: And number 2, I just want</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 retailer liability claims are only focused on</p> <p>2 consumers' co-insurance and co-payment amounts.</p> <p>3 Whereas, the manufacturer liability claims are</p> <p>4 related to total payments for the at-issue drugs in</p> <p>5 the at-issue time periods and the at-issue data.</p> <p>6 Q So suppose a manufacturer -- strike</p> <p>7 that.</p> <p>8 Suppose the manufacturers paid to</p> <p>9 consumers all of the damages in Table 1 under</p> <p>10 "Consumer Damages." That would mean the consumers</p> <p>11 were satisfied in full, correct? There'd be no</p> <p>12 damages left for the retail pharmacy defendants to</p> <p>13 pay?</p> <p>14 MR. HONIK: Object to the form and to</p> <p>15 the extent it calls for a legal conclusion</p> <p>16 regarding ultimate allocation.</p> <p>17 THE THE COURT REPORTER: Ultimate...</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: Allocation.</p> <p>19 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Again, allocation</p> <p>21 concerns are outside the scope of my analysis.</p> <p>22 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>23 Q And I -- and I understand that. And</p> <p>24 actually that was going to be my next question.</p> <p>25 Do you ever -- you know, do you make</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 to preserve my ongoing objection that your</p> <p>2 question really requires a legal conclusion</p> <p>3 about what liability will yield in the way of</p> <p>4 an allocation as directed by a court or a</p> <p>5 jury's verdict or otherwise.</p> <p>6 With that, she can answer.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>8 So this is your hypothetical, and</p> <p>9 these are your assumptions. They're not mine.</p> <p>10 And my understanding is that -- that</p> <p>11 those determinations are ones that will be</p> <p>12 answered by a court and a jury. They are --</p> <p>13 they are outside my purview as I've already</p> <p>14 testified.</p> <p>15 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. I'm going to try to ask another</p> <p>17 hypothetical question to get at it -- to get at it a</p> <p>18 different way.</p> <p>19 Assume a world in which all of -- all</p> <p>20 that has occurred to date has occurred except the</p> <p>21 filing of the lawsuit. And Aurobindo and Hetero and</p> <p>22 Mylan and Teva and Torrent and ZHP paid to consumers</p> <p>23 the sum total of [REDACTED], whatever the number is</p> <p>24 on the bottom of that --</p> <p>25 MS. KAPKE: Which I should note, for</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 the record, that that's considered -- that 2 number is considered a confidential number for 3 purposes -- thank you for zooming in -- for 4 purposes of the protective order. I'm going to 5 start my question over.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>7 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>8 Q Yeah. Assume a world in which 9 everything has occurred except for the filing of 10 the -- of this lawsuit. And independent of a 11 lawsuit, the manufacturers listed in Table 1 pay out 12 to consumers the damages listed in column -- the 13 column marked "Consumer Damages" in Table 1.</p> <p>14 So outside of the legal realm, in that 15 instance, do the consumers have any damages left?</p> <p>16 MR. HONIK: Note my objection on the 17 same basis as previously stated and insofar as 18 this is an improper hypothetical and well 19 beyond the scope of a health economist's 20 opinion as expressed here. Finally, I would 21 just add by way of objection that what you're 22 really getting at is a kind of reallocation, 23 not allocation. And I remind everyone that 24 what Dr. Conti has done is to simply present a 25 methodology for assessing damages, the</p>	<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 question. I'm sorry. Are we still in 2 that -- this weird hypothetical world?</p> <p>3 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>4 Q No.</p> <p>5 A I wasn't asked to calculate or do any 6 analysis of?</p> <p>7 Q No. I'm asking a separate question.</p> <p>8 A Oh, okay.</p> <p>9 Q Does -- would the -- the consumer 10 damages total represent a full refund of all the 11 money that the consumer spent on the at-issue 12 valsartan?</p> <p>13 MR. HONIK: Same objection as 14 previously stated.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: A full refund? What do 16 you mean by "a full refund"? I don't use that 17 term in my report, so I would like you 18 to -- I'd like you to define it for me.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Would it -- I'll -- I'll withdraw that 21 question.</p> <p>22 What do the numbers in the "Consumer 23 Damages" column of Table 1 represent?</p> <p>24 MR. HONIK: Objection, asked and 25 answered.</p>
<p>1 allocation of which, at trial or otherwise, is 2 outside the scope of the purview of her 3 assignment.</p> <p>4 You may answer.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I have no answer. I 6 mean, I have no -- I'm not a lawyer, and I have 7 no assessment of whether or not that payment --</p> <p>8 THE THE COURT REPORTER: That 9 payment...</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: That payment is -- 11 satisfies the claims or not. It's completely 12 outside the scope of my assignment in this 13 case.</p> <p>14 MR. HONIK: Are you making an offer, 15 Kara?</p> <p>16 MS. KAPKE: Sorry. I was chewing ice. 17 Oh, that was your attempt at being funny. 18 Sorry, Ruben. I should have laughed.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Does Table 1, "Consumer Damages," 21 represent a full refund of all the consumers spent 22 on the at-issue valsartan?</p> <p>23 MR. HONIK: Object to the form and for 24 the reasons previously stated.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I don't understand your</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Let's go back to my 2 explanation of how Table 1 was calculated.</p> <p>3 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>4 Q You know what? I can withdraw that 5 question. That's okay.</p> <p>6 A I'm happy to go -- I mean, I'm on 7 paragraph 60. It's described as paragraph 60 8 through 62.</p> <p>9 Q And that's fine. Ruben's right. You 10 have -- you've answered that question.</p> <p>11 I -- I want to ask about -- it says 12 right above Table 1, "Total damages across defendant 13 manufacturers and retailers are not intended to be 14 summed."</p> <p>15 Can you elaborate on what you mean by 16 that?</p> <p>17 A I'm not there yet. Hold on.</p> <p>18 So, again, this is about the 19 deduplication that we have been talking about for a 20 while now. Let's start from the beginning of the 21 paragraph. It's the -- it's the paragraph -- it's 22 the previous page. Thank you.</p> <p>23 In paragraph 79, I explain, "The 24 following tables present aggregate damages across 25 all theories of liability. Details on aggregate</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 damages for defendant manufacturers and retailers at 2 the group, subgroup and state level are provided in 3 the attachments in this declaration. In Table 1, I 4 present deduplicated aggregate damages across all 5 theories of liability for the defendant 6 manufacturers. In Table 2, I prevent" -- "I present 7 deduplicated aggregate damages across all theories 8 of liability for the defendant retailers. In 9 Table 3, I present deduplicated aggregate unjust 10 enrichment damages for the defendant retailers. As 11 described in footnote 62 above, some claims fall 12 into multiple theories of liability. Therefore, 13 total damages across defendant manufacturers," full 14 stop, "and retailers are not intended to be summed." 15 What I mean by that is, the Table 1 16 damages are deduplicated. Table 2 damages, across 17 different theories of liability, are also 18 deduplicated. I also have footnotes, 72 and 73, for 19 Tables 1 and 2 that -- that make that clear as well. 20 Q Do you have an estimation of what 21 percentage of the pharmacy market is covered by the 22 pharmacy defendants in this case? 23 MR. HONIK: Object to form. 24 THE WITNESS: Well, some of the 25 largest pharmacies in America are listed in the</p>	<p>Page 74</p> <p>1 (Whereupon, a short break was taken.) 2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:03. 3 We're back on the record. 4 BY MS. KAPKE: 5 Q Dr. Conti, during the last break, or 6 any breaks today, have you had any communications 7 with anyone? 8 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 9 extent it may reveal confidential and 10 privileged counsel communication. 11 But without waiver of the objection, 12 she may answer. 13 THE WITNESS: I have spoken to my 14 counsel. 15 BY MS. KAPKE: 16 Q During both breaks? 17 MR. HONIK: Same objection. 18 You may answer. 19 THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 BY MS. KAPKE: 21 Q Okay. Have you -- have you had any 22 communications with staff? 23 A You already asked me that question at 24 the last break, and I said no. So at this same 25 break -- at this next break, no, I did not have any</p>
<p>1 retailers table. CVS, Walgreens, Walmart are 2 absolutely enormous sellers of prescription 3 drugs in the U.S. market. 4 BY MS. KAPKE: 5 Q And do you have an estimate of -- of 6 what percentage that is? 7 A No. 8 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. 9 You're both talking on top of each other. 10 So I have, "Do you have an estimate of 11 what percentage that is" as a question. And I 12 have, "No" as an answer. 13 THE WITNESS: No. I said not off the 14 top of my head. 15 BY MS. KAPKE: 16 Q That's fine. 17 Okay. I want to -- let's go back to 18 the formulas in your report on paragraph 60 and 61. 19 A Are we changing topics? 20 Q Yeah. 21 A Okay. Great. I would like to take a 22 break then, please. 23 MS. KAPKE: Okay. 24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:55. 25 We're going off the record.</p>	<p>Page 75</p> <p>Page 77</p> <p>1 communications with my staff. 2 Q Okay. Perfect. 3 So I have a couple of questions that, 4 again, I'm not really intending to be super 5 controversial. But I just want to make sure I 6 understand. 7 So let's go to your report. And 8 paragraph 60 and 61, you reference consumer class 9 expenditures by breaking down into full payments for 10 uninsured cash paying purchases on the one hand -- 11 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Kara. 12 I'm sorry. I lost you. 13 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I -- I don't see 14 it either. 15 THE COURT REPORTER: "Consumer class 16 expenditure by breaking it down into full 17 payments for the uninsured" ... 18 MS. KAPKE: Cash paying purchases on 19 one hand, and this is the formula. And co-pays 20 for insurance -- or for insured consumers. 21 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. You -- hold 22 on. I just want to try to understand what 23 you're asking. So you referenced paragraph 60. 24 Where do you see that? Because I don't see it. 25</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>2 Q Your formula.</p> <p>3 A In paragraph -- in paragraph 60 on</p> <p>4 Formula 1? It is not related -- it does not break</p> <p>5 down into different types of payor types.</p> <p>6 Q I'm looking at Formula 2 in</p> <p>7 paragraph 61.</p> <p>8 A Okay. So you said -- you directed me</p> <p>9 to paragraph 60 and 61. I'm just trying to follow.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. Here's my question. When you</p> <p>11 reference uninsured cash paying purchases, are you</p> <p>12 referring to anyone who did not have a co-pay, or</p> <p>13 are you referring to a subset of those who paid with</p> <p>14 physical cash?</p> <p>15 A I don't understand your question. I'm</p> <p>16 sorry.</p> <p>17 Q In other words, are you -- are you</p> <p>18 including in your formula uninsured patients who</p> <p>19 paid for valsartan with a credit card? Do</p> <p>20 you -- what do you mean by cash?</p> <p>21 A Okay. Cash is cash, right? So what I</p> <p>22 mean by this is they are paying out of pocket. The</p> <p>23 method of payment, whether it be literally a \$5 bill</p> <p>24 or using a credit card, from the industry's</p> <p>25 perspective, both of those types of payments, that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>2 You can answer.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I'm not following. What</p> <p>4 are the three groups?</p> <p>5 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>6 Q The insured, co-pay or co-insurance</p> <p>7 pay group purchasers?</p> <p>8 A Hold on. Those are two groups, not</p> <p>9 three.</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: Yeah.</p> <p>11 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>12 Q That's what I don't understand --</p> <p>13 THE COURT REPORTER: I can't take this</p> <p>14 down. I cannot do that. One at a time.</p> <p>15 MR. HONIK: Kara, respectfully, I</p> <p>16 think you misspoke. You said insured. I think</p> <p>17 you meant cash. It's cash, co-pay,</p> <p>18 co-insurance.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q No. So I'm looking at the third --</p> <p>21 under where -- the third line there, it says, Qdt</p> <p>22 co-pay equals the quantity of product d purchased at</p> <p>23 time period t for, 1, insured, 2, co-pay or 3,</p> <p>24 co-insurance paying purchasers.</p> <p>25 I don't know and -- I don't know what</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 people are paying out of pocket, they are paying in</p> <p>2 cash.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. That's what I assumed. I need</p> <p>4 to check all of my assumptions, and that's what</p> <p>5 we're here to do here today.</p> <p>6 So for the uninsured cash paying</p> <p>7 purchases, the formula requires input of the full</p> <p>8 purchase price of the product. How is that</p> <p>9 determined for the uninsured cash paying purchaser?</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: Objection, asked and</p> <p>11 answered.</p> <p>12 You can answer.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: It's the full amount</p> <p>14 that they paid at the pharmacy counter for the</p> <p>15 at-issue drugs.</p> <p>16 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And then for the other part of</p> <p>18 the formula, you're looking at insured co-pay or</p> <p>19 co-insurance paying purchasers -- purchasers,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Right. That's what it says here.</p> <p>22 Q Yes. Here -- here is my question: Is</p> <p>23 there a difference between insured co-pay or</p> <p>24 co-insurance paying purchasers? Is there some sort</p> <p>25 of delineation between those three groups?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 you mean, if there is a distinction between those</p> <p>2 three words, insured, co-pay or co-insurance. Or do</p> <p>3 they all mean the same thing?</p> <p>4 A Are you asking me for the definition</p> <p>5 of insured, co-pay, co-insurance?</p> <p>6 Q I'm asking if there's a difference</p> <p>7 between those -- those three things.</p> <p>8 A Okay. There is a variable in the</p> <p>9 Xponent data that delineates or distinguishes</p> <p>10 between people who are paying cash -- they're</p> <p>11 uninsured for that specific prescription -- and</p> <p>12 people who are -- who are insured and still are</p> <p>13 required to pay a co-insurance or co-pay amount.</p> <p>14 So the first part of this last phrase,</p> <p>15 "insured or cash" in the previous tab under</p> <p>16 "quantity," delineates the distinction. Are these</p> <p>17 people cash paying, or are these people insured and</p> <p>18 paying a co-payment or a co-insurance? And the way</p> <p>19 that you can tell the difference is if you go to the</p> <p>20 term "Qdt cash," those are uninsured cash paying</p> <p>21 purchasers.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: And for the court</p> <p>23 reporter, you should actually highlight the</p> <p>24 first row. Dt cash equals uninsured cash</p> <p>25 paying purchasers.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And this --</p> <p>3 A Hold on, just to make sure that we're</p> <p>4 on the same page.</p> <p>5 And then for people who are insured,</p> <p>6 sometimes they don't have to pay anything when they</p> <p>7 get their prescription filled, particularly for</p> <p>8 really low-cost generic drugs. And sometimes they</p> <p>9 are still required by their insurer to pay a</p> <p>10 co-insurance and a -- or a co-payment amount, and</p> <p>11 then their insurer may pay the remainder.</p> <p>12 That is the distinction that we are</p> <p>13 making here -- or that I am making here.</p> <p>14 Q Thank you. That's helpful.</p> <p>15 Is there a difference between a co-pay</p> <p>16 and a co-insurance?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q What is that?</p> <p>19 A So co-payments tend to be flat. In</p> <p>20 other words, \$5 for every -- every generic</p> <p>21 prescription or \$1 for every generic prescription.</p> <p>22 Whereas co-insurance is a percentage of the total</p> <p>23 paid amount or the total charge for their</p> <p>24 prescription. So it's -- to make it really</p> <p>25 concrete, it will be 15 percent of the total paid</p>	Page 82	<p>1 So the economic price for damages</p> <p>2 equals the price of each at-issue prescription sold</p> <p>3 and paid. That relates to the liability damages</p> <p>4 that you offered up a formula for, not the unjust</p> <p>5 enrichment damages that you offered an opinion on;</p> <p>6 is that correct?</p> <p>7 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>8 A I don't follow your question.</p> <p>9 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>10 Q Okay. I'll withdraw it.</p> <p>11 Okay. Let's go to the unjust</p> <p>12 enrichment formula. I don't remember what paragraph</p> <p>13 that is.</p> <p>14 MR. HONIK: 63.</p> <p>15 MS. KAPKE: Thanks. Thank you, Ruben.</p> <p>16 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>17 Q The basic formula you list here is</p> <p>18 revenue minus costs, and then you expand that out to</p> <p>19 provide additional detail. And I want to ask about,</p> <p>20 first, revenue.</p> <p>21 To determine revenue, you offer a</p> <p>22 formula of average out-of-pocket costs for Unit 2</p> <p>23 consumers of product d sold by the retailer over</p> <p>24 time period t. In this formula, does this average</p> <p>25 out --</p>	Page 84
<p>1 amount.</p> <p>2 Q Got it. Thank you.</p> <p>3 Okay. Let's go to Paragraph 56 of</p> <p>4 your report. And can you read to yourself</p> <p>5 the -- that paragraph?</p> <p>6 A So that's finished.</p> <p>7 Q Let me know when you're done.</p> <p>8 MR. HONIK: It's a request. She'd</p> <p>9 like you to read it.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. It's a</p> <p>11 request, all right. Just -- just following.</p> <p>12 MR. HONIK: Yeah.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>14 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>15 Q Are you alleging that the retail</p> <p>16 pharmacy defendants committed fraud?</p> <p>17 MR. HONIK: Object to the form and to</p> <p>18 the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>19 You can answer.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: We already talked about</p> <p>21 this multiple times. I was asked to assume</p> <p>22 what was in the complaint and discussed in my</p> <p>23 Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>24 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>25 Q Got it.</p>	Page 83	<p>1 A I don't see that. I'm sorry.</p> <p>2 So actually, I -- I define retail</p> <p>3 revenue of product -- product d, sold to consumers</p> <p>4 over time period t. Is that what you're referring</p> <p>5 to?</p> <p>6 Q Uh-huh.</p> <p>7 A Okay. And then I go on to talk about</p> <p>8 revenue expressed in Formula 5.</p> <p>9 Q Correct.</p> <p>10 A Correct. Okay.</p> <p>11 Q And in Formula 5, the consumer, PPU,</p> <p>12 is the average out-of-pocket cost per unit to</p> <p>13 consumers of product d sold by the retailer over</p> <p>14 time period t?</p> <p>15 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>16 You can answer.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: That's what it says</p> <p>18 here.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Does that average out-of-pocket</p> <p>21 cost per unit to consumers in your formula include</p> <p>22 only class members or all individuals who are</p> <p>23 dispensed at-issue valsartan?</p> <p>24 MR. HONIK: Object to form and to the</p> <p>25 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.</p>	Page 85

22 (Pages 82 - 85)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 You can answer.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I don't 3 understand the question you're asking. Can you 4 please clarify?</p> <p>5 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>6 Q For purposes of your formula, when 7 you're calculating the average out-of-pocket cost 8 per unit to consumers, are you including in 9 consumers, in your theoretical world, all consumers 10 of at-issue valsartan or only class members?</p> <p>11 MR. HONIK: Object to form, calls for 12 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>13 You may answer.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I mean, as a -- as a 15 mechanical concern, we're only -- or I'm only 16 calculating based on consumers that paid for 17 the at-issue drugs in the at-issue time period, 18 their out-of-pocket cost.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Would the average out-of-pocket cost 21 include consumers who paid nothing?</p> <p>22 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, and 23 class membership is a legal matter, beyond the 24 scope.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I don't understand what</p>	Page 86	<p>1 theoretical perspective, saying that you need to 2 factor in the average cost of product -- the average 3 out-of-pocket cost per unit to consumers, when 4 you're doing that average, are you including 5 consumers --</p> <p>6 A In theory -- in theory or in practice?</p> <p>7 Q In theory.</p> <p>8 A Okay.</p> <p>9 Q In theory, does your average include 10 those consumers who paid nothing?</p> <p>11 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>12 You can answer.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: So by definition, 14 mechanically, they would contribute 0, right? 15 And so there is no payment made.</p> <p>16 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>17 Q So do you include them in the 18 denominator?</p> <p>19 A They fall out of the denominator in 20 theory because they pay 0.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. I want to go to the formula to 22 determine costs in your report.</p> <p>23 So retailer costs of dispensing 24 product d to consumers over time period t, do you 25 see that?</p>	Page 88
<p>1 you're asking. I'm sorry.</p> <p>2 MS. KAPKE: Okay. And, Ruben, I'm 3 going to just ask a question that's untethered 4 to my prior questions.</p> <p>5 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>6 Q So in looking at this formula --</p> <p>7 MR. HONIK: Does "untethered" mean 8 crazy?</p> <p>9 MS. KAPKE: No.</p> <p>10 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>11 Q I just want to -- I want to try and 12 figure out this -- how you're deriving average 13 out-of-pocket cost per unit to consumers.</p> <p>14 MR. HONIK: Okay.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: There's a formula. Then 16 there's a mechanical calculation. Those are 17 two different things, right?</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: That's the mash-up 19 problem, Kara. You're mashing up two things.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't --</p> <p>21 MS. KAPKE: Okay.</p> <p>22 MR. HONIK: I'm sure Dr. Conti can 23 explain it to you though.</p> <p>24 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>25 Q Okay. When you are, from a</p>	Page 87	<p>1 Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Are you referring in your formula 3 here, from the theoretical perspective, only to the 4 amount of money that a pharmacy would pay to a 5 wholesaler or directly to a manufacturer for the 6 dispensed product?</p> <p>7 A Go down to Formula 6 on the next page, 8 and you can see how I defined costs. Retail costs 9 of dispensing to consumers can be expressed in 10 Formula 6 as a function of the quantity of units of 11 product d sold to consumer over time period t and 12 the average retailer cost per unit of product d over 13 time period t to dispense to consumers. It is the 14 cost of dispensing.</p> <p>15 Q And that would include what?</p> <p>16 A Well, the retailers took 17 out -- interpreted that as the dispensing fee and 18 took the dispensing fee for each prescription out of 19 the data that was provided to us.</p> <p>20 Q I want to -- I want to remove the 21 mechanical aspects and just talk about this from a 22 theoretical perspective.</p> <p>23 If you are -- are looking at this from 24 a purely academic perspective, what do you want to 25 see in terms of defining retailer costs for purposes</p>	Page 89

23 (Pages 86 - 89)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 of this formula?</p> <p>2 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I'm not calculating</p> <p>4 retailer costs here. I'm talking -- I'm</p> <p>5 referring to dispensing costs. They are</p> <p>6 different things.</p> <p>7 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>8 Q Okay.</p> <p>9 A I mean, that's what's listed here.</p> <p>10 Retailer cost of this dispensing to consumers,</p> <p>11 that's -- that's what I'm -- that's the object in</p> <p>12 theory that I'm referring to.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And the same question; taking</p> <p>14 away the mechanical aspect of this, in theory, from</p> <p>15 a purely academic perspective, what do you want to</p> <p>16 see in terms of retailer cost of dispensing to</p> <p>17 consumers?</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: It's the unit cost of</p> <p>20 dispensing a given prescription to a given</p> <p>21 patient.</p> <p>22 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>23 Q What goes into that?</p> <p>24 A The marginal cost of dispensing will</p> <p>25 be the labor cost of filling the -- the vial and</p>	<p>Page 90</p> <p>1 those are point of sale costs, because my</p> <p>2 understanding is that -- is that they are not.</p> <p>3 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>4 Q I'm asking you if -- what your formula</p> <p>5 takes into consideration.</p> <p>6 A I already defined that. It's the cost</p> <p>7 of dispensing a product to the consumer.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. So if -- and let's just take a</p> <p>9 hypothetical --</p> <p>10 A Another hypothetical.</p> <p>11 Q -- outside -- outside of valsartan.</p> <p>12 Say a drug -- say a pharmacy purchases</p> <p>13 a drug from -- directly from a manufacturer for \$10</p> <p>14 and then sells that drug to an uninsured customer</p> <p>15 for \$20. And say that the dispensing costs are \$5,</p> <p>16 and we're in this weird world where we know that the</p> <p>17 dispensing costs are \$5. Is the profit, under your</p> <p>18 formula, \$5 or \$10?</p> <p>19 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Okay. So you have a</p> <p>21 very -- that is -- that is a hypothetical that</p> <p>22 is bizarre in many ways. And I'm not aware of</p> <p>23 a generic drug having a dispensing fee of \$5</p> <p>24 ever associated with it. So let's just</p> <p>25 dispense it.</p>
<p>1 actually giving it to the patient. It might include</p> <p>2 some additional costs as well. But they are</p> <p>3 marginal -- marginal to the dispensing of an actual</p> <p>4 unit to a patient at the point of sale.</p> <p>5 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: At -- excuse me -- the</p> <p>7 point of sale.</p> <p>8 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: It can be the cost of</p> <p>10 the vial itself. It can be the cost of a paper</p> <p>11 bag. It can be the cost of the clerk sitting</p> <p>12 at the pharmacy counter actually giving it to</p> <p>13 the patient and ringing them up for the charge.</p> <p>14 It could be the incremental cost of the</p> <p>15 pharmacist, actually their time inputting the</p> <p>16 drug into the -- the unit, and then into the</p> <p>17 bag that they get at the pharmacy counter.</p> <p>18 Those are dispensing costs.</p> <p>19 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>20 Q Does your formula take into account,</p> <p>21 in addition to dispensing costs, the actual cost of</p> <p>22 the drug that retailer pharmacy defendants would pay</p> <p>23 to whomever they obtained the drug for -- from?</p> <p>24 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Are you saying that</p>	<p>Page 91</p> <p>1 At the end of the day, it is the</p> <p>2 cost -- the dispensing costs are the costs that</p> <p>3 are incremental to a given patient in a given</p> <p>4 drug at the point of sale.</p> <p>5 So as I mentioned before, it's the</p> <p>6 cost of putting the drug in the vial. It's the</p> <p>7 cost of putting it in the bag. It's the cost</p> <p>8 of printing the label and giving all the</p> <p>9 consumer information to the consumer. It might</p> <p>10 be the labor cost of the pharmacist talking to</p> <p>11 the patient about the benefits and side-effects</p> <p>12 of taking this drug relative to others, and</p> <p>13 side-effect profile of that drug at the point</p> <p>14 of sale. That's what I think dispensing cost</p> <p>15 means.</p> <p>16 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>17 Q Thank you for that.</p> <p>18 And I'm -- I'm just trying to</p> <p>19 understand if your -- if the cost of procurement is</p> <p>20 included in your formula for cost?</p> <p>21 A Where do you see in my report that the</p> <p>22 cost of procurement is included in my definition of</p> <p>23 dispensing costs?</p> <p>24 Q I'm asking you a question.</p> <p>25 A I have defined dispensing cost five</p>

24 (Pages 90 - 93)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 separate times. It's also defined very clearly in 2 my report. This is a --</p> <p>3 Q I'm not asking you --</p> <p>4 A Excuse me. This is a term of art in 5 this field. I am using it correctly and precisely, 6 and I have restated over and over again the 7 definition of dispensing cost.</p> <p>8 Q I understand that.</p> <p>9 I'm not asking you if your -- so your 10 formula is revenue minus costs?</p> <p>11 A No. My formula is retail cost of 12 dispensing to consumers. That is in Formula 6 --</p> <p>13 Q Okay. I'm looking at --</p> <p>14 A -- where I define the cost of 15 dispensing to the consumer at the point of sale. 16 It's the quantity of the unit times average retailer 17 cost per unit of dispensing to the consumer.</p> <p>18 Dispensing to the consumer is a cost. Anyone who 19 knows anything about this industry knows what a 20 dispensing cost is. It's related to the labor and 21 capital that goes into handing a prescription of the 22 drug to a patient at the pharmacy counter. That is 23 what I am using here as cost.</p> <p>24 Q Let's look at Formula 4, please.</p> <p>25 A No. I'm not -- I mean, I'm happy to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 out of the data they gave me. There's no -- this is 2 not a theoretical. This is an -- this relates to an 3 actual thing, that you, the retailers, know what it 4 is because you took it out of the data that was 5 provided to myself and my staff.</p> <p>6 Q What are DIR fees?</p> <p>7 A They are payments that can be made 8 between entities in the pharmaceutical industry.</p> <p>9 Q Is it your understanding that DIR fees 10 are typically collected retrospectively after the 11 point of sale?</p> <p>12 A My understanding is that there's a 13 range of different arrangements.</p> <p>14 THE THE COURT REPORTER: There is or 15 there isn't a range?</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: There is a range of 17 different arrangements. And they only relate 18 to certain types of products and a certain type 19 of transaction and certain time periods. The 20 use of DIR fees have been growing over time.</p> <p>21 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>22 Q Are there other fees besides DIR fees 23 that are assessed after the point of sale?</p> <p>24 A For who to who?</p> <p>25 Q For commercial plans.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 go back to Formula 4. But, again, I define the cost 2 in Formula 4 as related to Formula 6, the cost of 3 dispensing to consumers. They are one and the same.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. That's what I'm trying to 5 understand. And -- and I'm sorry if I am -- I -- I 6 don't understand -- I don't understand the answer to 7 this question.</p> <p>8 Does the formula in Formula 4, when it 9 says revenue minus costs, does costs there refer to 10 any costs other than the dispensing costs that you 11 have identified for me and explained?</p> <p>12 A Again, the cost defined in Formula 4, 13 cost dt, is defined underneath cost dt equals the 14 retailer cost of dispensing product d to consumers 15 over time period t.</p> <p>16 I then go on to define cost in more 17 detail where I say, retailer costs of dispensing to 18 consumers can be expressed in Formula 6 as cost dt 19 equals Qdt, the quantity of units of product d sold 20 to consumers over time period t times the retailer 21 CPUDt, the average retailer cost per unit of product 22 d over time period t to dispense to consumers. I 23 can't -- I can't be any clearer than that.</p> <p>24 And clearly, the retailers know what a 25 dispensing fee is because they actually took that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 A I don't -- I don't understand -- I 2 don't understand the question.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. I'll withdraw it.</p> <p>4 Can you explain, generally, what a 5 dispensing fee is?</p> <p>6 MR. HONIK: Objection, asked and 7 answered.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Like, seven times, but 9 who's counting?</p> <p>10 So a dispensing fee is a fee that is 11 charged to consumers and to third-party payors 12 for the dispensing of a prescription at the 13 point of sale.</p> <p>14 BY MS. KAPKE:</p> <p>15 Q Who do you believe pays the dispensing 16 fee?</p> <p>17 A Well, I'll tell you that I went to the 18 pharmacy earlier this week, and I paid the 19 dispensing fee. So usually for oral drugs, 20 consumers at the point of sale pay dispensing fees 21 if they --</p> <p>22 THE THE COURT REPORTER: If they what?</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: If they are required to. 24 If they have insurance that covers those 25 dispensing fees, insurers will pay for those</p>

25 (Pages 94 - 97)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 98	Page 100
1 dispensing fees. It depends on the 2 arrangement.	1 THE WITNESS: That's great. Thank 2 you.
3 BY MS. KAPKE:	3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:41.
4 Q What pharmacy do you -- did you use?	4 This ends Media Number 2. We're going off the
5 A CVS. They're my favorite.	5 record.
6 Q Who determines what the dispensing fee	6 (Whereupon, a short break was taken.)
7 is?	7 MR. HONIK: Plaintiffs are back at
8 A I don't know. I'm assuming the	8 11:46 and are ready to proceed.
9 pharmacy itself, but I don't know.	9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:49.
10 Q Is it negotiated over time?	10 This begins Media Unit Number 3. We're back on
11 MR. HONIK: Object to form.	11 the record.
12 THE WITNESS: I don't know.	12 EXAMINATION BY MR. CAMPBELL:
13 BY MS. KAPKE:	13 Q Okay. Good morning, still, Dr. Conti.
14 Q How much do you think a dispensing fee	14 My name is Dan Campbell. I'm going to ask you some
15 typically amounts to?	15 questions about your opinions --
16 A For an oral generic drug, it can be on	16 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You
17 the order of cents or a dollar. Usually, it's	17 trailed off. You're going to ask questions...
18 nominal, but it really depends.	18 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
19 Q In terms of your profit calculations,	19 Q Regarding your opinions about the
20 did the cost of the ingredients factor in in any	20 wholesalers in this case.
21 way?	21 A Okay.
22 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, asked	22 Q Can you hear me okay, Dr. Conti?
23 and answered.	23 A Yes.
24 THE WITNESS: Again, I have defined	24 Q Okay.
25 the cost related to the dispensing fee.	25 MR. CAMPBELL: And, Madam Court
Page 99	Page 101
1 Dispensing fees, as I understand them, do not	1 Reporter, can you hear me okay, also?
2 relate to the cost of the ingredient, but might	2 THE COURT REPORTER: You're a little
3 relate to whether the product is generic or	3 low, but I can hear you.
4 branded or the formulation of the product.	4 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. I pulled the
5 Because, again, there's labor costs associated	5 microphone as close as I can get it here, so I
6 with that dispensing fee, and some drugs	6 will do the best I can.
7 require more labor costs and more capital	7 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
8 to -- to deal with them.	8 Q So, Dr. Conti, you talked a lot
9 BY MS. KAPKE:	9 yesterday about your role as a professor, your
10 Q You mentioned a couple of times how	10 coursework, your class work. How much of that
11 products are commonly repackaged and relabeled by	11 coursework, that class work, involves
12 private label distributors and retailers. Are you	12 wholesaler-specific issues?
13 making any allegations in this case that CVS, or any	13 A I have spent some time understanding a
14 retail pharmacy defendant in this case, repackaged	14 wholesaler's role in this industry. I have had the
15 or relabeled valsartan?	15 pleasure of working with some folks at Cardinal and
16 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.	16 at AmerisourceBergen and in multiple contexts.
17 THE WITNESS: I don't know.	17 THE COURT REPORTER: Did you say
18 MS. KAPKE: I am, for purposes of	18 -- did you say Amerisource?
19 time, am going to pass the witness.	19 THE WITNESS: AmerisourceBergen.
20 MR. HONIK: Thank you.	20 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay.
21 THE WITNESS: Thank you.	21 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
22 I think now is a good time for me to	22 Q In what sort of context --
23 take a break then, please.	23 A And Cardinal.
24 MR. HONIK: Okay. Five minutes	24 Q Thank you.
25 enough?	25 A Yeah.

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 Q In what context did you work with 2 those folks at Cardinal and AmerisourceBergen? 3 A Again, just in the normal course of my 4 business, I spend a lot of time trying to understand 5 how this industry works and the role wholesalers has 6 is part of the -- part of the ecosystem. 7 Q Were you -- 8 A So I can be -- I can be more specific. 9 I've been on -- I've been on panels and conferences. 10 I've been in closed-door meetings, discussing 11 various issues related to reimbursement, financing, 12 organization, regulation, where wholesaler 13 representatives have been there. And I know 14 something about the wholesaler data that -- that 15 wholesalers such as Cardinal and AmerisourceBergen 16 maintain. What else should I tell you? 17 I teach about the role of wholesalers 18 in this ecosystem and have had the pleasure of 19 reviewing shareholder reports of AmerisourceBergen, 20 Cardinal and other public wholesalers operating in 21 the U.S. market. 22 Q And so you mentioned that earlier this 23 morning. Those are the public finance reports that 24 you reviewed either last night or this morning? 25 A No, I mean -- so, again, I'm talking</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 Q Okay. All right. We may follow up 2 with your counsel on that. 3 A Sure. 4 Q Have you -- you mentioned earlier 5 today a study that you did, I think when you were a 6 professor at Chicago, involving Walgreens and data 7 that you were working with from -- from Walgreens. 8 Do you remember that discussion? 9 A Yes. 10 Q Okay. Have you ever done any sort of 11 similar study with the wholesaler or with wholesaler 12 data like the Walgreens study? 13 A I have -- so, I have never published 14 work in -- 15 THE THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I 16 have never published working... 17 THE WITNESS: Work in collaboration 18 with the wholesalers who are members in this 19 matter. I have looked at wholesaler data where 20 the -- it was shared with me at a screen share. 21 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 22 Q What sort of wholesale data was shared 23 with you on a screen share? 24 A Transaction data for specific drugs. 25 Q Related to the drugs at-issue in this</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 generally. So part of my course that I teach on 2 Strategy in the Pharmaceutical Industry requires 3 that my students do shareholder report analysis. 4 And we focus both on pharmaceutical manufacturers, 5 but also other entities that are important in the 6 supply chain, which include the wholesalers and also 7 include some of the retailers that we've talked 8 about. 9 There are a handful of shareholder 10 reports that I looked at over the past couple of 11 days that include Mylan, Teva -- I think maybe one 12 more of the defendant manufacturers. And I 13 certainly looked over gross revenues of the retailer 14 pharmacies as well. 15 Q Do you remember any specific 16 individuals at Cardinal or AmerisourceBergen at any 17 of those conferences or panels when you were there 18 with them? 19 A Not off the top of my head. I am in 20 email correspondence with a number of former 21 executives working on some work related to private 22 labeling activities for some drugs that went into 23 short supply, but not ones that are related in this 24 matter. I'm more than happy to tell you who those 25 are. I just don't have them off the top of my head.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 case? 2 A No. 3 Q And do you remember the components of 4 the transaction data that were shared with you? 5 A Yeah. There were drug names, units 6 and -- 7 THE COURT REPORTER: And... 8 THE WITNESS: Paid amounts. 9 And there were also, I think, 10 manufacturer names as well. But in this 11 specific context, we were -- we were actually 12 looking at the differences in -- 13 THE THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. 14 Somebody is shuffling papers. 15 We were looking at the differences 16 in... 17 THE WITNESS: We were looking at 18 transactions -- I'm sorry. There's a lot of 19 background noise. I hear it too. 20 There's -- there were transactions 21 related to manufacturers and -- for specific 22 drugs. And then the relabeling of certain 23 product by the wholesaler distributors for 24 certain types of product. 25</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>2 Q Were there any confidentiality</p> <p>3 agreements related to that data that you were shown?</p> <p>4 A I -- in at least one interaction, I</p> <p>5 did sign a confidentiality agreement. But it wasn't</p> <p>6 for any of the wholesalers that are named in this.</p> <p>7 Q You said that was a screen share. So</p> <p>8 did you take any documents back with you? Do you</p> <p>9 have any documents on your computer or on your desk</p> <p>10 or anything like that?</p> <p>11 A No. I wish, but no. Yeah.</p> <p>12 Q And was it that experience and looking</p> <p>13 at that data that informed your opinions here about</p> <p>14 the damages calculation as to wholesalers?</p> <p>15 A Well, we talked about this yesterday,</p> <p>16 that -- I mean, I've spent every day for the past</p> <p>17 20 years thinking about how this -- how this system</p> <p>18 works, and specifically how prescription drugs go</p> <p>19 from base ingredients to -- to API to fill and</p> <p>20 finish, manufacturing, you know, through the supply</p> <p>21 chain, which includes distributors and then,</p> <p>22 ultimately, to reach our pharmacies or to hospitals</p> <p>23 or to medical groups and then, finally, to be</p> <p>24 infused, injected or dispensed to consumers.</p> <p>25 Certainly, the role of wholesalers is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 Q It took you many hours, also, to write</p> <p>2 the report, correct?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. All right. Do you remember how</p> <p>5 much of that time you actually spent writing the</p> <p>6 last two pages of the report, which has the formulas</p> <p>7 for the wholesalers, the proposed formulas?</p> <p>8 A Yeah. I thought a lot about those</p> <p>9 last two -- those last two pages.</p> <p>10 Q Do you know the number of hours you</p> <p>11 spent on those last two pages?</p> <p>12 A No, sorry, not off the top of my head.</p> <p>13 As I told you, I -- I have been a little bit remiss</p> <p>14 in getting my time together. I like to double and</p> <p>15 triple check it before I submit it, and it's been a</p> <p>16 busy couple of months. So I don't know. I'm sorry.</p> <p>17 Q That's all right.</p> <p>18 And in the records that you do have of</p> <p>19 the time that you spent on the report, would they</p> <p>20 indicate which parts of the report you were working</p> <p>21 on?</p> <p>22 A Not really.</p> <p>23 Q So will we ever see an invoice, for</p> <p>24 example, that breaks down which portions of the</p> <p>25 report you were working on in a given time entry?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 a very important one in this field, and one that I'm</p> <p>2 involved -- I routinely understand and -- and am</p> <p>3 thinking about in -- in my academic roles. So</p> <p>4 therefore, by definition, it informs how I think</p> <p>5 about their role in this case. But...</p> <p>6 Q Got you.</p> <p>7 A I actually haven't spent that much</p> <p>8 time writing about distributors and wholesalers, in</p> <p>9 part because the data is all --</p> <p>10 THE COURT REPORTER: The what?</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: The data is opaque.</p> <p>12 It's not normally what we -- I have access to</p> <p>13 in my -- in the course of my daily research --</p> <p>14 research.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>16 Q You mentioned yesterday that the</p> <p>17 report, which is, I think, Exhibit 5, that that</p> <p>18 report took you, I think you said many months to</p> <p>19 write. Do you remember that?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And we looked at some of the</p> <p>22 hours yesterday, and let's just say dozens of hours</p> <p>23 to write your report, right?</p> <p>24 A I don't understand your question. I'm</p> <p>25 sorry.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 A Do you mean, like, Section 1, 2 and 3?</p> <p>2 Q Yes, or -- or by page number?</p> <p>3 A I haven't apportioned to that. That's</p> <p>4 just not how I work, so no.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. If you --</p> <p>6 MR. CAMPBELL: If Mr. or Ms. Tech</p> <p>7 could pull up the report, I think it's</p> <p>8 Exhibit 5. And, Dr. Conti, I'm going to refer</p> <p>9 you to Attachment B to start with, please.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>11 Q Dr. Conti, let me know when you're at</p> <p>12 Attachment B.</p> <p>13 A Just give me a second.</p> <p>14 Q Sure.</p> <p>15 A Okay.</p> <p>16 Q And I'm going to stay on the first</p> <p>17 page of Attachment B, so you don't have to worry</p> <p>18 about flipping pages here. Do you see the section</p> <p>19 that's the second section that's called "Case</p> <p>20 Documents"?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q All right. So in this section of case</p> <p>23 documents, is this a list of all the documents that</p> <p>24 are -- in this matter, in this case, that you --</p> <p>25 that you reviewed?</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 110	Page 112
<p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q So there are no documents coming out</p> <p>3 of this case that you reviewed but did not list?</p> <p>4 A Right. Other than in the course of</p> <p>5 normal events in my daily life, I know something</p> <p>6 about all of these -- all of the defendants.</p> <p>7 Defenses.</p> <p>8 Q Right. Okay. And so you list here</p> <p>9 one declaration of Matthew Sample. Do you see that?</p> <p>10 It's the second one listed.</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Do you know who Matthew Sample is an</p> <p>13 employee of?</p> <p>14 A I don't, not off the top of my head.</p> <p>15 Oh, I do, actually. It's in Footnote 76, defendant</p> <p>16 wholesaler AmerisourceBergen Corporation represented</p> <p>17 that producing such data would be --</p> <p>18 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry,</p> <p>19 Doctor. Producing such data would be...</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Footnote 76, if</p> <p>21 we can go back to my main report.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>23 Q And, Dr. Conti, you don't need to read</p> <p>24 it. I just wanted to ask you a simple question.</p> <p>25 Did you review any other -- or any declarations from</p>	<p>1 Cardinal Health, McKesson or AmerisourceBergen in</p> <p>2 this case, correct?</p> <p>3 A Correct.</p> <p>4 Q Did you ask to see any electronic data</p> <p>5 from any of them?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q All right. And so who did you ask?</p> <p>8 A Counsel.</p> <p>9 Q What were you told?</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: Let me note my -- note my</p> <p>11 objection. It invades the attorney work</p> <p>12 product and other privileges.</p> <p>13 But without waiver of that objection,</p> <p>14 she may answer.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: That there were -- that</p> <p>16 there was no --</p> <p>17 THE THE COURT REPORTER: That there</p> <p>18 was no...</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Data produced.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>21 Q Let me refer you back in your report</p> <p>22 to Paragraph 3, early on in your report --</p> <p>23 MR. CAMPBELL: If the tech can get</p> <p>24 back to that area, please.</p> <p>25</p>
Page 111	Page 113
<p>1 any other wholesaler representatives --</p> <p>2 A Not -- not off the top --</p> <p>3 Q -- in this case?</p> <p>4 A Not off the top of my head.</p> <p>5 Q And did you review any documents that</p> <p>6 were produced by either Cardinal Health or McKesson</p> <p>7 or AmerisourceBergen?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q Did you review any deposition</p> <p>10 testimony from any representatives of</p> <p>11 Cardinal Health, McKesson or AmerisourceBergen?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q And a little bit further down, I</p> <p>14 believe on this first page of Attachment B -- I'm</p> <p>15 sorry. I misspoke earlier when I said we were going</p> <p>16 to stick on Page 1 of the Attachment B.</p> <p>17 If you can please go to Page 4 of</p> <p>18 Attachment B. Do you see Page 4 here, Dr. Conti?</p> <p>19 It has a section called "Electronic Data"?</p> <p>20 A I see that.</p> <p>21 Q And it goes over Page 5 for several</p> <p>22 pages after that, correct?</p> <p>23 A Correct.</p> <p>24 Q I just want to confirm you did not</p> <p>25 review any electronic data from either</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>2 Q And I just want to ask you, Dr. Conti,</p> <p>3 while -- I'll set it up for you while the tech is</p> <p>4 going back. I want to ask you about some of the</p> <p>5 assumptions regarding wholesalers specifically.</p> <p>6 Okay?</p> <p>7 A Okay.</p> <p>8 Q So you say in Paragraph 3 that,</p> <p>9 "Plaintiffs' counsel have also asked me to assume</p> <p>10 that a subset of these at-issue valsartan products</p> <p>11 were sold by defendants AmerisourceBergen Co,</p> <p>12 Cardinal Health and McKesson Co, collectively</p> <p>13 referred to as the defendant wholesalers."</p> <p>14 Do you see that Paragraph 3?</p> <p>15 A I do.</p> <p>16 Q What do you mean in here when you</p> <p>17 wrote the word "subset"?</p> <p>18 A That some of the at-issue products</p> <p>19 were sold to -- in the...</p> <p>20 THE THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.</p> <p>21 In the...</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I said the at-issue</p> <p>23 drugs were sold by the manufacturers to these</p> <p>24 specific wholesalers. There were other --</p> <p>25 there are other wholesalers, obviously,</p>

29 (Pages 110 - 113)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 involved in the U.S. market. And at a given 2 period in time, manufacturers are going to sell 3 specific drugs to specific wholesalers. 4 That's what I mean.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>6 Q And then there were also transactions 7 where the manufacturer sold directly to the retail 8 pharmacies?</p> <p>9 A Correct.</p> <p>10 Q Were you asked to assume any 11 particular percentage of this subset that were sold 12 through the wholesalers?</p> <p>13 A I was -- I was not, and that's because 14 during the at-issue time period, 2012 through 2018, 15 there was very significant asymmetric information. 16 And so the contamination of the products was 17 not -- was known by the manufacturers, but they were 18 not known by other members of the supply chain.</p> <p>19 THE THE COURT REPORTER: Of the...</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Supply chain.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>22 Q Were you told to -- in this case, in 23 rendering your opinions in this declaration, were 24 you told to assume anything about the wholesalers' 25 conduct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 MR. HONIK: Object to the form. 2 THE WITNESS: Correct. I don't -- I 3 don't actually mechanically do any 4 calculations. All I'm doing is laying out how 5 I would think about calculating unjust 6 enrichment in this matter for these specific 7 drugs at-issue in this specific period.</p> <p>8 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>9 Q In any of the prior cases where you 10 have been an expert, have you similarly attempted to 11 calculate unjust enrichment damages for wholesalers?</p> <p>12 A Not that I can recall off the top of 13 my head.</p> <p>14 MR. CAMPBELL: If I could please ask 15 the tech to go to Paragraph 50 of your report.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>17 Q And, Dr. Conti, please just let me 18 know when you're there.</p> <p>19 A Okay.</p> <p>20 Q And I actually want to refer you to 21 the second sentence in Paragraph 50, "Given that the 22 at-issue valsartan products are small molecule 23 orally formulated generic drugs, the majority of 24 purchases are made by pharmacies from 25 wholesalers/distributors."</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 A Other than what was laid out in the 2 complaint and listed in my Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. 3 Q So you are not offering any opinions 4 yourself in this declaration about the wholesalers' 5 conduct in this case, correct?</p> <p>6 MR. HONIK: Object to the form. 7 You can answer.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Correct. Correct. This 9 is...</p> <p>10 THE THE COURT REPORTER: Can you 11 repeat that, please?</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Sure.</p> <p>13 It's on instruction or for -- it's on 14 instruction by counsel.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>16 Q You're not offering any opinions 17 whether wholesalers are liable for unjust 18 enrichment?</p> <p>19 A I'm not a lawyer, sir, so no. I was 20 asked to assume certain details for the purposes of 21 my report.</p> <p>22 Q So your opinions, with respect to the 23 wholesalers in this case, is limited to essentially 24 proposing a formula for calculating unjust 25 enrichment damages?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 Do you see that sentence?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Why does the fact, as you write here, 4 that the at-issue valsartan products are small 5 molecule orally formulated generic drugs -- why does 6 that mean that the majority of purchases were made 7 by pharmacies from wholesalers and distributors?</p> <p>8 A Yeah. So the -- for me, the context 9 is important. So the supply chain for specialty 10 drugs that are infused or injected can be different. 11 And so those products can be handled by different 12 distributors or group purchasing organizations. 13 Usually, they have different storage requirements, 14 and their end consumer is different too. It's 15 usually hospitals or outpatient clinics, maybe some 16 specialty pharmacies. It's just a -- it's just a 17 different supply chain.</p> <p>18 The orally formulated generic drugs 19 are the ones that are really are at-issue in this 20 matter, and here, they are largely going through the 21 distributors, as listed here.</p> <p>22 Q And you just said, "largely." And in 23 your report, you say, "majority," but you don't know 24 exactly what the percentage is, right?</p> <p>25 A I think in the Deloitte and Touche</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 article, I -- I footnote to this paragraph. It has, 2 "A number of distributor handles 92 percent of 3 pharmaceutical sales in the U.S. market." And that 4 is largely related to orals. It's not related to 5 these specialty drugs. If you actually look at the 6 backup of the Deloitte paper, the Deloitte paper 7 also talks about 11 million prescription units being 8 sold each day and handled through the distributor 9 at-issue -- such as these in this case.</p> <p>10 Q That article is talking about industry 11 wide, right?</p> <p>12 A Industry wide, absolutely.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. So for the at-issue valsartan 14 products in this case, you have no idea what the 15 percentage is that were sold through the 16 wholesalers?</p> <p>17 A Well, so again, in that same footnote, 18 Footnote 47, the first paragraph, Mylan and Teva in 19 their public reporting talk about total sales going 20 through the -- through distributor. Shareholder 21 reports specifically report those type of sales in 22 aggregate and not for specific drug NDC codes, which 23 is really at-issue here. So we know one thing, but 24 we don't know at the actual NDC batch lot number 25 that we -- we might switch to.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 the supply chain. Is that correct? Is that what 2 you're asking?</p> <p>3 Q Yes, if you could answer that 4 question; is that correct?</p> <p>5 A Yes, that is correct.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. All right.</p> <p>7 A Again, as a general matter.</p> <p>8 Q As a general matter. Great.</p> <p>9 So with respect to its role in the 10 supply chain, wholesalers are not putting the 11 product out into the -- into the consumer market?</p> <p>12 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, may 13 call for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>14 You can answer.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>16 So -- well, I mean, I guess -- I mean, 17 they are an important part of the supply chain, 18 and wholesalers do take --</p> <p>19 THE COURT REPORTER: They do take 20 what?</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Do take title from 22 manufacturers. They hold those drugs in a 23 warehouse, usually, and then hand them off to 24 the resale -- to the -- sorry -- to the retail 25 pharmacies. Or it might be a little bit of an</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 Q Okay. So for the at-issue valsartan 2 products here, we don't know what the percentage is 3 that were sold through the wholesaler distributor?</p> <p>4 A Right. We just have these industry 5 averages and averages that are specific to the 6 manufacturers, not at the NDC code level.</p> <p>7 Q And just to confirm, wholesalers, they 8 don't sell these products into the consumer market, 9 correct?</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, it may 11 call for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What do you 13 mean by that?</p> <p>14 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>15 Q I couldn't hear what you said. You 16 didn't know what I meant. So what was your 17 question?</p> <p>18 A Can you please ask it again? Thank 19 you.</p> <p>20 Q Yes. Yes. Just to confirm, 21 wholesalers do not sell these products directly to 22 patients, correct?</p> <p>23 A Okay. So I think what you mean is 24 that, as a general matter, retail pharmacies sell to 25 consumers. Wholesalers occupy a different art of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 accounting mix where they take title, but 2 actually, the manufacturers drop ship directly 3 from their warehouse to the --</p> <p>4 THE COURT REPORTER: To the what?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: To the retail 6 pharmacies.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>8 Q And then it's the retail pharmacies 9 that sell to the patients, correct?</p> <p>10 A That's my understanding -- well, 11 for -- for products that are sold in the retail 12 class of trade. There are -- there are drugs that 13 are sold to physicians and hospitals or specialty 14 pharmacies -- pharmacies that have a slightly 15 different distribution chain. But that's not what 16 we're -- that's largely not what we're talking about 17 here.</p> <p>18 Q These products at-issue in this case, 19 the at-issue valsartan products, were sold by the 20 retail pharmacies to the consumers, to patients?</p> <p>21 A Right. So there probably are 22 valsartan that were sold -- there are probably 23 at-issue valsartan products that were sold to 24 hospitals or sold to outpatient clinics for their 25 own stocking to take care of patients. But as a</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 mechanical matter, my damage estimation is focused 2 on largely the retail class of trade.</p> <p>3 I can actually see a cross trade in 4 the IQVIA data, but we're largely focused on the 5 retail class of trade.</p> <p>6 Q All right.</p> <p>7 MR. CAMPBELL: If you can -- if the 8 tech can, please, go to Paragraph 80.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>10 Q And -- and if you could go there too, 11 Dr. Conti, please.</p> <p>12 A Sure. I'm trying to follow. Hold on.</p> <p>13 Okay.</p> <p>14 Q All right. And I'm really just going 15 to focus on this first sentence here at 80 where you 16 wrote, "I have also been asked by plaintiffs' 17 counsel to develop a methodology for calculating 18 defendant wholesaler unjust enrichment damages for 19 the at-issue valsartan products."</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q What is your understanding of unjust 23 enrichment?</p> <p>24 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 25 extent it calls for a legal opinion.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 damages, are you aware that that might vary from 2 state to state, depending on the state law?</p> <p>3 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 4 extent it calls for a legal opinion.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Nothing in the U.S. is 6 easy. But basically, I would say, yes. I 7 understand generally that state -- there are 8 state rules related to damage calculations and 9 specifically related to liability and also 10 unjust enrichment. But, again, I'm not a 11 lawyer. I understand these as a mechanical 12 issue.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>14 Q And did your proposed formula for 15 calculating unjust enrichment damages as to 16 wholesalers take into account, in any way, those 17 differences from one state to another?</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: Same objection as 19 previously noted.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: So I didn't do this -- I 21 didn't have any data. So I didn't do that at 22 the state level, but I expect if I had the 23 data, this would be limited by state law, 24 according to instructions from counsel for the 25 jury.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Okay. So, again, I'm 2 not a lawyer. What I view is that the 3 wholesalers took title of these products and 4 then resold them into the retail class of 5 trade. And it's the difference between what 6 they acquire the drugs at -- for -- from when 7 they purchase from the manufacturer to what 8 they received from the retailers when they sold 9 it into the market and the delta that is 10 at-issue here.</p> <p>11 And later on in this section, I'm a 12 little bit more specific about the profit that 13 is made off -- through the wholesalers moving 14 these products from A to B.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And we'll get to those formulas 17 in just a couple of minutes, as you probably were 18 expecting.</p> <p>19 Are you aware, when it comes to unjust 20 enrichment, that there are different elements of 21 proof from one state to another for an unjust 22 enrichment claim?</p> <p>23 A I am generally aware of -- that states 24 have different rules for unjust enrichment.</p> <p>25 Q And same for the proper measure of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 THE COURT REPORTER: For what?</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: For the jury. From 3 instruction of counsel, the court or the jury. 4 My -- my method is flexible to accommodate 5 those state-specific rules.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>7 Q Have you been given any descriptions 8 of those differences in a law from one state to 9 another so far?</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 11 extent it may invade the attorney work product 12 privilege and other confidentiality privileges. 13 But with that and without waiver of 14 those objections, I'll allow her to answer.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Again, I didn't have any 16 data to do this calculation mechanically, so it 17 wasn't really -- it wasn't a detail that I 18 focused on.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>20 Q When you say the detail that you were 21 focused on, you mean a difference between one state 22 versus another state and how the damages are 23 calculated for unjust enrichment?</p> <p>24 A No. I mean by that, that I didn't 25 mechanically calculate anything for wholesalers.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 And so to the extent that unjust enrichment as 2 applied to the wholesalers in this matter for these 3 at-issue drugs might differ, I didn't do anything 4 with that information because I had nothing to do. 5 I don't have the data to do that based on the state. 6 That's kind of a different part of the calculation 7 even for what I did for retailers or for defendants 8 in the different theories of liability.</p> <p>9 Q Can you tell us now how you would 10 account in your formula for those differences from 11 one state to another, or is that something that you 12 would reserve for later?</p> <p>13 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the 14 extent it calls for a legal conclusion and/or 15 instruction from judge, jury or counsel.</p> <p>16 You may answer.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>18 Honestly, I think of it as a 19 mechanical issue and one that I would wait on 20 the instruction of counsel, the court or the 21 jury to -- to do.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>23 Q And the formula that you propose for 24 the unjust enrichment damages is essentially 25 profits. And that's defined as revenues minus cost</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 please. And I just want to clarify one thing. 2 You see in this Paragraph 8, 3 "Consequently, the appropriate measure of damages in 4 this matter is the total amount paid by each 5 plaintiff for the at-issue valsartan products 6 manufactured and/or sold by the defendants."</p> <p>7 Do you see that paragraph?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q That's not referring to the proper 10 measure of damages for wholesalers, right?</p> <p>11 A Under the theory of unjust enrichment.</p> <p>12 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Under the theory of 14 unjust enrichment, correct.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>16 Q So this -- what's described in 17 Paragraph 8 refers to other defendants, not 18 wholesalers?</p> <p>19 A That is correct.</p> <p>20 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>21 I think -- Jamie, did you get the 22 answer?</p> <p>23 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.</p> <p>24 MR. HONIK: Thank you.</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 as you have there at the beginning of Paragraph 81, 2 right?</p> <p>3 A Correct.</p> <p>4 Q Why did you decide on that being the 5 formula for unjust enrichment damages? Where did 6 that come from?</p> <p>7 A Because, again, as I understand it, 8 unjust enrichment is simply the amount of money made 9 off of the transaction for moving drugs from one 10 place to another net of cost.</p> <p>11 Q Did you rely on any written materials 12 that told you that was the proper measure of damages 13 for unjust enrichment?</p> <p>14 A I relied on counsel's instruction and 15 kind of general understanding of what I know of 16 unjust enrichment.</p> <p>17 Q So is counsel's instruction that the 18 proper calculation of damages for unjust enrichment 19 is revenues minus cost?</p> <p>20 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>22 I should wait. Yes.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>24 Q If you could -- actually, go back real 25 quick to Paragraph 8 in the -- in your report,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Back to your calculation of 3 unjust enrichment damages, so we talked a lot 4 yesterday about the value of the product or about 5 the lack of value of the product in -- in your 6 opinion. I don't want to get into any of that. I 7 just want to ask one simple question about the value 8 of the product.</p> <p>9 Do you base your calculation of unjust 10 enrichment damages as to wholesalers on the basic 11 premise that the products are worthless?</p> <p>12 THE COURT REPORTER: That the profits 13 are worthless?</p> <p>14 MR. CAMPBELL: That the products.</p> <p>15 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I am -- so in the 17 wholesaler context, really, all that's at play 18 here is the wholesalers moved at-issue products 19 from one place to another. And therefore, they 20 profited off of that movement.</p> <p>21 The full value of the products that 22 they moved from one place to another is related 23 to the price that they paid for them over every 24 unit that they paid for them minus their cost 25 of acquiring, storing, other --</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>Page 130</p> <p>1 THE COURT REPORTER: Other...</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Other offsets that they</p> <p>3 may -- may have experienced.</p> <p>4 So, really, it's just the full price</p> <p>5 that the wholesalers acquired those products at</p> <p>6 minus all of their costs that -- that is -- is</p> <p>7 related to my calculation here.</p> <p>8 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>9 Q And so your calculation as to the</p> <p>10 wholesalers for unjust enrichment damages, it</p> <p>11 doesn't matter if the products are -- are worthless</p> <p>12 or not?</p> <p>13 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: For my purposes, I am --</p> <p>15 I was asked to -- so for my purposes, it's just</p> <p>16 the amount of money that the wholesalers made</p> <p>17 off moving these products from one place to</p> <p>18 another.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>20 Q Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. CAMPBELL: And if the tech could</p> <p>22 go back to Paragraph 80, and next -- next page</p> <p>23 on Paragraph 80. Okay.</p> <p>24 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>25 Q You see the sentence that starts off</p>	<p>Page 132</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I said correct. I said</p> <p>2 correct. And these are -- I'm sorry. My</p> <p>3 computer wants to reboot. Correct.</p> <p>4 I mean, these are major Fortune 500 or</p> <p>5 Fortune 1,000 companies. They have -- as you</p> <p>6 know, AmerisourceBergen and Cardinal and others</p> <p>7 have revenues, annual revenues, on the order of</p> <p>8 Costco. And these are huge public -- publicly</p> <p>9 traded companies. They must profit off their</p> <p>10 business, or they wouldn't report revenue that</p> <p>11 looks like that. But I have not been shown any</p> <p>12 data to assess exactly how much they -- these</p> <p>13 wholesalers made off of moving from point A to</p> <p>14 point B, the specific issues in this matter.</p> <p>15 THE COURT REPORTER: In what?</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: The specific drugs in</p> <p>17 this matter.</p> <p>18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel, I'm</p> <p>19 getting a lot of background noise. If we can</p> <p>20 just try to reduce that as best as we can.</p> <p>21 Thank you.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>23 Q All right. And in the next couple of</p> <p>24 sentences in Paragraph 80, you talk about,</p> <p>25 "Wholesalers did not manufacture the products, nor</p>
<p>Page 131</p> <p>1 with, "Like the defendant retailers"? We don't have</p> <p>2 the first couple of words, but the first couple</p> <p>3 words highlighted here are "like the"?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. "Like the defendant retailers,</p> <p>6 these companies profited from the distribution of</p> <p>7 the at-issue valsartan products to pharmacies and</p> <p>8 other entities."</p> <p>9 On what do you base that statement</p> <p>10 there, that these companies profited?</p> <p>11 A Right. So this is just the theory of</p> <p>12 unjust enrichment that as -- so just kind of as a</p> <p>13 general matter, we know that wholesalers move</p> <p>14 drug -- they take title of drugs. And then they</p> <p>15 move them to other purchasers, or they sell them to</p> <p>16 other purchasers. So it's just the difference</p> <p>17 between the -- the amount they sold and the amount</p> <p>18 that they gained that is of issue here.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. So this is the theory. It's</p> <p>20 not based on any actual records or documents that</p> <p>21 you've seen so far?</p> <p>22 MR. HONIK: Object to the form of the</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I</p> <p>25 didn't hear an answer.</p>	<p>Page 133</p> <p>1 did they sell the products to consumers and TPPs."</p> <p>2 And then you say, "Consequently, the</p> <p>3 data that could be used to calculate unjust</p> <p>4 enrichment damages for defendant wholesalers differs</p> <p>5 from that of the defendant retailers described</p> <p>6 above."</p> <p>7 Do you see that sentence?</p> <p>8 A Yes, that's what it says.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. In what ways does the data that</p> <p>10 could be used to calculate unjust enrichment damages</p> <p>11 for wholesalers differ from the retailers?</p> <p>12 A So, again, the -- the wholesalers</p> <p>13 purchased these products at one price and -- in</p> <p>14 aggregate and then sell them at another. It's just</p> <p>15 the delta that matters.</p> <p>16 And the -- the purchase price is going</p> <p>17 to be reported in data just like -- and the products</p> <p>18 themselves, the name of the manufacturers, the lot,</p> <p>19 the batch, the NDC code, all of that should be</p> <p>20 preserved in this data. But the actual cost of</p> <p>21 sales will be -- will be different.</p> <p>22 Q And have you ever seen that sort of</p> <p>23 data for -- for wholesalers other than -- I think</p> <p>24 you mentioned the screen share earlier in the call.</p> <p>25 But have you otherwise ever seen that sort of data</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 for wholesalers?</p> <p>2 A Yeah. I have seen that data,</p> <p>3 and -- under Track and Trace and earlier versions of</p> <p>4 Track and Trace that are maintained by the states</p> <p>5 through the EPedigree system. My understanding is</p> <p>6 that wholesalers keep track of that data down to the</p> <p>7 unit penny.</p> <p>8 Q And you're referring to the cost of</p> <p>9 the -- you said the cost of the sales earlier. So</p> <p>10 you mean the sale to the retailer?</p> <p>11 A Yeah. And -- and the price that the</p> <p>12 wholesalers are paying to the manufacturers as well.</p> <p>13 So they -- they know how much they're purchasing and</p> <p>14 at what price for what. And they know how much</p> <p>15 they're selling for, by whom, for what, down to the</p> <p>16 retailer level as well.</p> <p>17 Q And I just want to make sure I</p> <p>18 understand. On what is that based, your</p> <p>19 understanding that they -- they know all those</p> <p>20 things?</p> <p>21 A Again -- well, so under Track and</p> <p>22 Trace, they are required -- wholesalers are required</p> <p>23 to keep that information at that level of this</p> <p>24 aggregation, at the NDC manufacturer level and the</p> <p>25 unit level. And then states, on top of Track and</p>	<p>Page 134</p> <p>1 enter the retail class of trade in the U.S. has a</p> <p>2 barcode and is -- is traced through the entire</p> <p>3 system. So by definition, if the manufacturers are</p> <p>4 entering these products into the retail class of</p> <p>5 trade, then downstream members of the supply chain,</p> <p>6 whether it be wholesalers or retailers, are required</p> <p>7 to keep track of that product at the barcode level,</p> <p>8 which will contain information about the product,</p> <p>9 the -- the unit and -- and the manufacturers.</p> <p>10 Q What about elements of price? Does it</p> <p>11 track the elements of price?</p> <p>12 A What do you mean by "elements of</p> <p>13 price"?</p> <p>14 Q Well, the amounts received. Let's</p> <p>15 start, first of all, with the revenues.</p> <p>16 A Sure.</p> <p>17 Q Okay? Which is -- let's go to that</p> <p>18 part of your formula about the revenues, and that's</p> <p>19 in Paragraph 82.</p> <p>20 A Yeah.</p> <p>21 Q Okay.</p> <p>22 A I have that.</p> <p>23 Q All right. And it -- it says</p> <p>24 wholesaler revenue can be expressed in Formula 10 as</p> <p>25 Qdt multiplied by PPUDt. Do you see that?</p>
<p>Page 135</p> <p>1 Trace, have EPedigree systems that require all</p> <p>2 members of the supply chain in the United States to</p> <p>3 maintain units sold or purchased, which types of</p> <p>4 drugs by which types of manufacturers to ensure that</p> <p>5 they are not counterfeit.</p> <p>6 Q Have you ever had any specific</p> <p>7 conversations with someone who works for a</p> <p>8 wholesaler about the input needed to calculate</p> <p>9 profits on any given transaction or -- or drug?</p> <p>10 A I mean -- this field is awash in data,</p> <p>11 and I am aware that wholesalers are keeping track of</p> <p>12 their unit costs and their unit --</p> <p>13 THE COURT REPORTER: Their unit what?</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Or their revenues</p> <p>15 for -- for each transaction that they are going</p> <p>16 through every single day. Again, 11 million</p> <p>17 prescriptions units a day are going through the</p> <p>18 wholesalers in the U.S. market.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>20 Q Have you ever had any specific</p> <p>21 conversations with any of the wholesalers in this</p> <p>22 case, employees of the wholesalers in this case,</p> <p>23 that they are keeping that sort of data regarding</p> <p>24 the at-issue valsartan?</p> <p>25 A Again, any product that is allowed to</p>	<p>Page 137</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Did you consider any other inputs in</p> <p>3 determining revenue here for -- with respect to</p> <p>4 wholesalers?</p> <p>5 A Like what?</p> <p>6 Q Well, that's what I'm asking you. I'm</p> <p>7 asking you.</p> <p>8 A I don't -- I don't understand.</p> <p>9 Q Sure.</p> <p>10 You have QDt --</p> <p>11 A Right.</p> <p>12 Q -- and PPUDt as the two inputs that</p> <p>13 you multiply together to get revenue, right?</p> <p>14 A Right.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Did you consider any other</p> <p>16 things to multiply or include in this part of the</p> <p>17 formula that you decided should not be included?</p> <p>18 A This is a general formula. So it is</p> <p>19 inclusive of the aggregate units and the transaction</p> <p>20 prices for these units. Transaction prices could</p> <p>21 be -- are probably expressed in aggregate over</p> <p>22 products. And there may be a difference between</p> <p>23 gross prices paid and net prices paid. There might</p> <p>24 be offsets, return of goods, et cetera, that</p> <p>25 are -- that are part of either the revenue or part</p>

35 (Pages 134 - 137)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 of the cost.</p> <p>2 Q And how does that factor into your</p> <p>3 formula here?</p> <p>4 A It's inclusive.</p> <p>5 Q In what way?</p> <p>6 A And you can -- well, you can see</p> <p>7 in -- in Footnote 75, when calculating profit,</p> <p>8 offset may be removed from gross profit, so the jury</p> <p>9 or court find these to be reasonable deductions.</p> <p>10 These additional costs can be easily included.</p> <p>11 THE COURT REPORTER: Can be easily...</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Included.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>14 Q So your Paragraph 75 there, is that</p> <p>15 referring to -- for example, if we start with inputs</p> <p>16 to revenue, does that include rebates?</p> <p>17 A It could. It could, yes. So there's</p> <p>18 a gross price, and then there's returned goods.</p> <p>19 There's rebates that might be paid on aggregate</p> <p>20 purchased products or sold products. All of those</p> <p>21 would be considered, not gross revenue or not gross</p> <p>22 prices, but net prices and could be a part of those</p> <p>23 calculations if counsel or the court or the jury</p> <p>24 find that they should be included.</p> <p>25 Q Do you have an opinion on whether they</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 those inclusions if the court or the jury or</p> <p>2 counsel determined they should be included.</p> <p>3 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>4 Q Hypothetically, if a wholesaler came</p> <p>5 to you and asked you to help them calculate profits</p> <p>6 on a particular set of drugs outside the context of</p> <p>7 any litigation, would you include rebates in that</p> <p>8 calculation of profits?</p> <p>9 MR. HONIK: Note my objection,</p> <p>10 improper hypothetical.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Okay. I think we've all</p> <p>12 established how much I love hypothetical</p> <p>13 questions, and I think the answer to this one</p> <p>14 is just, it depends. It depends on the</p> <p>15 context.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>17 Q So in some context, you would include</p> <p>18 rebates?</p> <p>19 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, can</p> <p>20 you repeat that question?</p> <p>21 MR. CAMPBELL: Sure.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>23 Q In some context, you would include</p> <p>24 rebates in the calculation of revenues?</p> <p>25 MR. HONIK: Object to the form of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 should be included?</p> <p>2 MR. HONIK: Note my objection to the</p> <p>3 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: My method and the</p> <p>5 formula that's listed here is -- is general.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>7 Q And I'm not asking you in a legal</p> <p>8 opinion. I'm asking you as the expert health</p> <p>9 economist here. If you were calculating profits for</p> <p>10 a particular set of drugs for a wholesaler, would</p> <p>11 you factor in rebates?</p> <p>12 MR. HONIK: Note my objection. The</p> <p>13 ultimate answer to the question requires,</p> <p>14 respectfully, a legal determination, one that's</p> <p>15 beyond the scope.</p> <p>16 But with that, she can answer the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>19 So, again, I'm not a lawyer. I'm an</p> <p>20 economist. I would say if I didn't think that</p> <p>21 they -- that those factors should be</p> <p>22 considered, I would not have dropped the</p> <p>23 footnote that I did. We were just talking</p> <p>24 about Footnote 75. And, again, the method that</p> <p>25 is proposed is -- is flexible to accommodate</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: And you mean profits?</p> <p>3 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>4 Q Profits, sure.</p> <p>5 A Possibly.</p> <p>6 Q And with respect to rebates, do you</p> <p>7 understand that different customers have different</p> <p>8 rebate structures? I should say different</p> <p>9 wholesaler customers have different rebate</p> <p>10 structures?</p> <p>11 A What do you mean by "customers"?</p> <p>12 Q Sure.</p> <p>13 So one particular customer for a</p> <p>14 wholesaler might have a rebate structure that has</p> <p>15 these numbers or these incentives. And another</p> <p>16 customer for that same wholesaler might have a</p> <p>17 totally different rebate structure.</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I think I'm asking a</p> <p>20 much more basic question, which is who is the</p> <p>21 customer.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>23 Q It doesn't matter. Let's say --</p> <p>24 A Customer of whom?</p> <p>25 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Let's start from the</p> <p>3 beginning. Customer of whom?</p> <p>4 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>5 Q Yeah. A wholesaler customer.</p> <p>6 A Okay. So is that the manufacturer?</p> <p>7 So remember, wholesalers operate a two-sided market.</p> <p>8 So they are -- they have manufacturers that they are</p> <p>9 purchasing products from. That is one type of</p> <p>10 customer.</p> <p>11 And then they are selling downstream</p> <p>12 to other customers that are retail pharmacies and</p> <p>13 other members of the supply chain. So that's</p> <p>14 another type of customer. So I'm asking you which</p> <p>15 customer.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. So now I'm in the category of</p> <p>17 revenues, so I'm talking about the downstream</p> <p>18 customers.</p> <p>19 A Okay. Great.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. The -- the retail pharmacies,</p> <p>21 pick any two that you want to for the wholesalers.</p> <p>22 Do you understand that different customers,</p> <p>23 different retail or pharmacy customers, might have</p> <p>24 different rebate structures?</p> <p>25 A So as a general matter, I understand</p>	Page 142	<p>1 the other wholesalers at-issue here, they are</p> <p>2 massive corporations. Again, they have annual</p> <p>3 revenues larger than Costco. So they have --</p> <p>4 they hold very significant market power over</p> <p>5 their downstream retail customers.</p> <p>6 So in that setting, as a general</p> <p>7 matter, the entity that holds the more</p> <p>8 significant market power gets to dictate the</p> <p>9 terms of the contract. And so I'm assuming</p> <p>10 that AmerisourceBergen dictates the terms of</p> <p>11 the contract, and I expect those terms of the</p> <p>12 contract in a given period of time to not</p> <p>13 differ very significantly between retail</p> <p>14 customer or retail pharmacy -- between retail</p> <p>15 pharmacy and the retail pharmacy.</p> <p>16 Might there be slight deviations</p> <p>17 between them? Sure. But the general content</p> <p>18 is going to be driven by the entity that holds</p> <p>19 the market power.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>21 Q So you agree that --</p> <p>22 A Which is the wholesaler.</p> <p>23 Q So you agree that there might be</p> <p>24 slight variations in, for example, the amount of</p> <p>25 rebates given to one retailer versus another?</p>	Page 144
<p>1 that these contracts may include rebates that are</p> <p>2 generally paid in aggregate and are contracted to an</p> <p>3 advance of any specific transaction. So they're</p> <p>4 contracts that cover a period prospectively.</p> <p>5 If -- whether they differ materially</p> <p>6 from each other, I -- I think that they may differ</p> <p>7 in time. In other words, the contracting that</p> <p>8 occurs in 2020 as a general rule looks different</p> <p>9 than the contracting that might have occurred in</p> <p>10 2012. But if a differ -- I mean, AmerisourceBergen</p> <p>11 and Cardinal, they're really major players in this</p> <p>12 market. And they have significant market power. So</p> <p>13 I'm assuming that they have a pretty uniform</p> <p>14 contract that they are -- they have for signing with</p> <p>15 their downstream customers, the retailers.</p> <p>16 Q So your assumption is that, for</p> <p>17 example, for Cardinal Health, its contracts are</p> <p>18 going to look the same with respect to rebates with</p> <p>19 its retailer customers, no matter who the retailer</p> <p>20 costumer is?</p> <p>21 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>22 That's not her testimony.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: No -- yeah, I think</p> <p>24 you're mischaracterizing my testimony. What</p> <p>25 I'm saying is that AmerisourceBergen, Cardinal,</p>	Page 143	<p>1 A If they exist at all, right? I mean,</p> <p>2 there could be just cost contracts all together. It</p> <p>3 probably depends on the year and the products.</p> <p>4 Q And beyond just rebates, there might</p> <p>5 be other terms in the contracts that might differ</p> <p>6 from one retailer customer to another?</p> <p>7 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, calls</p> <p>8 for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Again, I haven't really</p> <p>10 thought about that in this matter that much.</p> <p>11 What I would say is, the contracts probably</p> <p>12 dictate a variety of different terms that are</p> <p>13 general -- that are general, amount sold at</p> <p>14 prices over which types of products in a given</p> <p>15 time period, what to do about charge backs or</p> <p>16 spoiled goods, what to do about whether there's</p> <p>17 aggregate volume discounts for purchasing a</p> <p>18 very large quantity of their certain products.</p> <p>19 There might also be wholesale rebates</p> <p>20 for -- in aggregate after the products have</p> <p>21 already been sold into the supply chain and</p> <p>22 maybe even to customers that are freed up</p> <p>23 later. Are all likely part of the contracts</p> <p>24 and might differ over time.</p>	Page 145

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 BY MR. CAMPBELL:</p> <p>2 Q Did you review any wholesaler and 3 retailer contracts produced in this litigation?</p> <p>4 A No, not in this matter, but I have 5 seen contracts between wholesalers and retail 6 pharmacies in the course of business.</p> <p>7 Q Any related to the products at-issue 8 in this litigation?</p> <p>9 A No. But, again, these are 10 really -- these are, you know, cheap generic drugs. 11 The -- and so I don't expect them to differ that 12 much or to be special in any way. Where I have seen 13 carve out or special considerations are for products 14 that have very special types of handling or shelf 15 life.</p> <p>16 Q And going to your formula for cost, 17 which is at the bottom of Page 33, it's Formula 11.</p> <p>18 Well, one thing I wanted to --</p> <p>19 A Hold on. Hold on. Let me just get 20 there.</p> <p>21 Q One thing before I continue on that, 22 one of the elements of your formulas is -- is the 23 concept of unit, correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q All right. What is your definition</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 Q Okay. So let me go to your formula 2 for cost. For the formula for cost, Formula 11, I 3 guess it is. It continues on to the top of the next 4 page. In this part of your formula for cost, did 5 you consider including charge backs?</p> <p>6 A Again, this is what I mean by, 7 in -- in that Footnote 75, that there could be 8 offsets to profit that could be considered, either 9 in the cost side or in the revenue side.</p> <p>10 I think I have already mentioned 11 charge backs as being an offset in the -- in our 12 earlier conversation. They may be related here or 13 important.</p> <p>14 Q And you would say the same thing for 15 rebates?</p> <p>16 A Again, I think of volume discounted as 17 being a more relevant term, but there might also be 18 rebates there.</p> <p>19 Q You mentioned discounts. You're 20 aware --</p> <p>21 A Wait a minute. I'm sorry. Just a 22 minute. Just to finish my thought.</p> <p>23 Again, I didn't do this mechanically. 24 I didn't have any data to do that, and so my method 25 that's being proposed here is general. And it's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 for -- for unit here in this formula for 2 wholesalers?</p> <p>3 A Yeah, it's -- it's quantity. It's 4 quantity, and usually at the wholesaler level, 5 they'll be -- it will be bottles or packages of 6 pills. But it might also be aggregated over larger 7 units, so, like, multiple pill packs or multiple 8 boxes of products.</p> <p>9 Q So a unit can be a different size, 10 basically?</p> <p>11 A Units can be different sizes, and the 12 size and the aggregate amounts contained in those 13 units are things that the wholesaler knows and keeps 14 track of. It's part of the requirements of Track 15 and Trace and also the EPedigree system that I 16 mentioned earlier.</p> <p>17 Q Does your formula account for the 18 differences in sizes between units?</p> <p>19 A Yes. And if I -- again, this 20 is -- this is a theoretical exercise. I have no 21 data. But I tend to be very anal about units sizes, 22 and so this would be done at a unit that may -- at 23 the most disaggregated unit that was appropriate. 24 And usually units for cost would match the units for 25 revenues, if I was doing this with data.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 really a different phase of the case, either upon 2 the instruction of counsel and upon of the 3 instruction from the court or jury, that those type 4 of offsets, if they exist, either for cost or for 5 revenue.</p> <p>6 Q But you would defer to the court or 7 the jury to decide whether those sorts of things 8 should be included?</p> <p>9 A Correct.</p> <p>10 Q And with the same -- you mentioned 11 discounts. Would the same thing apply, for example, 12 on the cost side, logistics fees or service fees?</p> <p>13 A For unjust enrichment calculations, 14 yes, that -- those also could potentially be 15 accounted for. My method is flexible to account for 16 them, again, upon the instruction of counsel, the 17 court or the jury.</p> <p>18 Q What about non-product-related costs, 19 for example, wholesaler overhead or employee costs 20 or IT costs, those sorts of things? Are those also 21 included in the offsets that you would defer to 22 whether the court or the jury says they should be 23 counted?</p> <p>24 A I think of all of these things -- so 25 to the extent that they're all related to cost of</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 goods, they would be related. Usually, I've seen 2 cost of goods break out those type of costs 3 separately.</p> <p>4 Q Employee costs, information technology 5 costs, store costs, those sort of things?</p> <p>6 A I mean there's -- they're -- they're 7 huge. They're so big. You know, they're their own 8 separate line items. They're -- they have their own 9 department that -- that accrues those costs and 10 accounts for those costs and that keeps track of 11 those costs and reports them to their shareholders. 12 I've -- I've used those as different cost of goods 13 for the unit being moved from one place to another. 14 Usually, that -- in gap accounting, they're 15 accounted for separately.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And then on the other inputs 17 for the costs, of all the things that you said, 18 maybe offsets, and you would defer to the court or 19 the jury to decide whether they're -- they're 20 counted. Those also will, or could, vary from 21 manufacturer to manufacturer depending on the 22 contract, right?</p> <p>23 A Okay. So I think we're switching. So 24 I think what you mean is that -- so now the customer 25 is the upstream customer to the wholesaler, right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 secrets in my general understanding of -- of how 2 this world works. I -- I wish I could see them, but 3 I haven't seen them in -- in -- in this matter. And 4 I have asked lots of questions of my wholesaler 5 friends about, kind of, generally how these work, 6 but I have never seen a contract.</p> <p>7 Q And do you agree that wholesalers 8 typically negotiate with the manufacturers when 9 they're entering into one of these contracts over a 10 bundle of goods and not with any one particular type 11 of product?</p> <p>12 A I mean, it depends on who the 13 wholesale -- I mean, it depends on who the 14 manufacturer is, right, and what the products are. 15 But -- so I do not -- I don't know the specifics of 16 the contracts between the wholesaler and the 17 specific manufacturers in this case.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. And I think you already 19 mentioned when you talked about the concept of time, 20 but it's your understanding that the contracts, both 21 types of contracts, the contracts between the 22 wholesalers and the manufacturers, and then the 23 wholesalers and the retail pharmacies, those 24 contracts can change over time, correct?</p> <p>25 A Yes. Typically, wholesalers would</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 It's the manufacturer?</p> <p>2 Q That's right?</p> <p>3 A Is that right?</p> <p>4 Q Yes.</p> <p>5 A Okay. So, again, same general gist, 6 which is wholesalers are method in terms of revenue 7 and in terms of market share relative to each 8 individual pharmaceutical company that they're 9 dealing with. And so for the contract between 10 AmerisourceBergen, for example, and any specific 11 small generic manufacturer, the entity that holds 12 the bargaining power is the wholesaler, not 13 generally the -- the manufacturer.</p> <p>14 So, again, I expect, just as a manner 15 of management, that the wholesalers here can dictate 16 the terms of purchase to these upstream 17 manufacturers, and they might differ a little bit by 18 time, by type of product, et cetera. But I don't 19 anticipate that within time and for a particular 20 type of product, there -- there to be very 21 significant differences.</p> <p>22 Q Did you review any of the contracts 23 between the wholesalers and the manufacturers that 24 were produced in this case?</p> <p>25 A No. Those are very closely held</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 contract upstream and downstream prospectively, and 2 those contracts will have a term. So they'll be 3 for -- prospectively, for a year, two years.</p> <p>4 Q And the terms may vary from 5 manufacturer to manufacturer or from retail pharmacy 6 to retail pharmacy?</p> <p>7 MR. HONIK: Objection, asked and 8 answered.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: So, again, you're -- if 10 you're a Fortune 1,000 company, such as these 11 in the U.S., they tend to be pretty routinized, 12 and also it's important to be routinized for 13 the principles of gap reporting for 14 shareholders. Again, these are public 15 companies. So --</p> <p>16 THE COURT REPORTER: They're to be 17 routinized?</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Routinized.</p> <p>19 THE COURT REPORTER: Routinized?</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>21 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Routinized.</p> <p>23 But as a general matter, my 24 understanding is that the contracts are for a 25 year or two, both upstream and downstream.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 154	Page 156
1	MR. HONIK: And let me -- let me just	1 a few questions for you.
2	note that it's the 1 o'clock hour. I think we	2 Do you still have your expert report
3	had a hard stop at this time, but to the extent	3 in front of you?
4	y'all need more time, I think Dr. Conti will	4 A I do.
5	make herself available at 4 p.m.	5 Q Okay. I'd would like to draw your
6	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I apologize. I'm	6 attention, please, to Paragraph 60.
7	actually late to meet my Dean. That's not a	7 A Just give me one second.
8	good -- that's not a good look for me.	8 Q It's on Page 23. Do you have it?
9	MR. HONIK: Let's go off the record	9 A Just one minute.
10	and release the witness for now, and counsel	10 Q Okay.
11	can confer.	11 A Yeah. Okay. I'm there.
12	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1 p.m.	12 Q Okay. And this -- in this, you
13	This ends Media Unit Number 3. We're going off	13 express the formula or the methodology for
14	the record.	14 calculating liability damages as -- effectively,
15	(Whereupon, a break was taken from	15 quantity as of the date and time for a particular
16	1 p.m. to 4 p.m.)	16 product over time period, times the price for that
17	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:03.	17 product over the same time period; is that correct?
18	This begins Media Unit Number 4. We're back on	18 A Correct.
19	the record.	19 Q Okay. And I believe that you
20	BY MR. ABRAHAM:	20 testified earlier today that, for Hetero, you
21	Q Good afternoon, Dr. Conti.	21 confined your damages analysis to prescriptions that
22	A Good afternoon.	22 were filled between May and August of 2018, correct?
23	Q My name is Eric Abraham -- Hetero Labs	23 A That's correct.
24	and Hetero Drugs. Can you hear me? You're	24 Q Okay. And that's consistent with
25	making --	25 Footnote 67 of your report, right?
	Page 155	Page 157
1	A No, I can't -- you just cut out again.	1 A Just give me one second. I have to
2	MR. HONIK: You briefly cut out, Eric.	2 double check. Yes, that's correct.
3	Keep going. Let's see how it goes. We'll let	3 Q Did you do any investigation to
4	you know if it's a problem.	4 determine whether any of Hetero's valsartan was sold
5	BY MR. ABRAHAM:	5 within that timeframe, May through August of 2018,
6	Q Okay. Let's make sure we get the	6 that did not contain an alleged nitrosamine
7	important point. I represent Hetero Drugs and	7 impurity?
8	Hetero Labs, and I'm going to be taking just a few	8 A I did not, and that's because my
9	additional questions today. All right?	9 analysis is prospective and under the assumption
10	Do you still have your report in front	10 that consumers and third-party payors could not tell
11	of you?	11 whether a product was contaminated or not -- or
12	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Does	12 could not tell whether a product was contaminated or
13	everyone hear the background noise? It's very	13 not with the nitrosamines and other potential
14	significant. There's -- it's like a computer	14 products.
15	noise.	15 Q So is it fair to say that you assumed,
16	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:04.	16 for purposes of your analysis, that if a
17	We're going off the record.	17 prescription was filled within that timeframe, May
18	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off	18 through August 2018, the valsartan contained the
19	the record.)	19 nitrosamine impurity?
20	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:05.	20 MR. HONIK: Object to form.
21	We're back on the record.	21 THE WITNESS: Right. So, again, and
22	BY MR. ABRAHAM:	22 as I write this -- I write in my report, there
23	Q Good afternoon, Dr. Conti. My name is	23 is fundamental asymmetric information in this
24	Eric Abraham from law firm Hill Wallack, and I	24 market. In other words, while the manufacturer
25	represent Hetero Labs and Hetero Drugs. I have just	25 might know the extent of the contamination of

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>Page 158</p> <p>1 their products, consumers nor third-party 2 payors knew of at the time that they were 3 making --</p> <p>4 THE COURT REPORTER: That they were 5 making...</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: At the time that they 7 were making those purchases. And therefore, 8 because my perspective is prospective, I'm 9 doing the analysis from the -- from the 10 perspective that -- of them and their 11 asymmetric information. I am counting all 12 products that were available for sale and 13 ultimately sold in the U.S. market. That does 14 not count -- that does not take into account 15 that there may have been different levels of 16 contamination that the manufacturer might have 17 known about their own product.</p> <p>18 BY MR. ABRAHAM:</p> <p>19 Q Okay. So to the extent that there may 20 have been valsartan manufactured by Hetero without 21 the impurity that was still sitting on the shelf at 22 the pharmacy in the May to August timeframe, those 23 sales would be included with -- in your damages 24 analysis, correct?</p> <p>25 A Correct. At --</p>	<p>Page 160</p> <p>1 both end-payor and consumer damages, attributable to 2 the Hetero Labs. Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A I do.</p> <p>4 Q Does that calculation follow the 5 formula that we talked about a few moments ago? It 6 was on Paragraph 60 of your report, in other words, 7 quantity times price?</p> <p>8 A Quantity times price, correct of all 9 products in that time period that are relevant for 10 that specific set of NDCs.</p> <p>11 Q Tell me what the quantity of pills you 12 used was for the Hetero Labs end-payor damages 13 calculation that resulted in roughly [REDACTED] in 14 damages?</p> <p>15 A Sure. Sales --</p> <p>16 Q No, just a number. What was the 17 number?</p> <p>18 A So sales of the product as recorded in 19 the IQVIA data in the relevant time period among 20 consumers that were -- among payors -- among 21 prescriptions that were dispensed and paid for by 22 third-party payors.</p> <p>23 Q I may not have been clear. I would 24 like to know what the number was that you used for 25 quantity within your equation.</p>
<p>Page 159</p> <p>1 Q I --</p> <p>2 A Wait. At this point in time --</p> <p>3 Q Right. I have very limited time, 4 Dr. Conti.</p> <p>5 A No. No. No. I understand. I just 6 need to -- but it's --</p> <p>7 Q You've answered my question.</p> <p>8 MR. HONIK: No, she hasn't. She 9 hasn't finished her answer.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: So, again, from my 11 perspective, at this point in time, my 12 assignment was to think about damages in a 13 prospective way from the consumer and 14 third-party payors' perspective. They did not 15 know whether the products that were being sold 16 and consumed by themselves or paid for by 17 themselves were contaminated or not, even if 18 the manufacturer did know.</p> <p>19 BY MR. ABRAHAM:</p> <p>20 Q Can you please turn to Table 1 of your 21 report?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q It's on Page 31.</p> <p>24 A Yeah.</p> <p>25 Q And you see you have a line here for</p>	<p>Page 161</p> <p>1 A So I don't have it in my report, but 2 it is easily discernable in the data that I have. 3 I'm more than happy to provide that to you.</p> <p>4 Q Please do. I'll ask your counsel to 5 provide me with that number.</p> <p>6 And what was the price that you used 7 to calculate the [REDACTED] number for end-payor 8 damages?</p> <p>9 A Same -- same answer, it was the price 10 that was paid by end-payors recorded in IQVIA data, 11 according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria for 12 the specific products that are Hetero -- that are 13 assigned to Hetero Labs.</p> <p>14 BY MR. ABRAHAM:</p> <p>15 Q But I would like to know what the 16 number was. Are you saying you don't know right now 17 what that number was?</p> <p>18 A I just said it's the same answer to 19 the question, which is -- by definition, it is price 20 times quantity that you're seeing here. And that -- 21 the native price recorded in the IQVIA data for each 22 product, month, year and payor is available in the 23 IQVIA data. And I'm more than happy to provide it 24 to you.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So same questions for consumer</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 damages, in other words, you would have to look back 2 at some data to tell me what the quantity was and 3 what the price was that you multiplied to come up 4 with your [REDACTED]</p> <p>5 A Right, subject to the criteria of 6 inclusion and exclusion, and subject to the 7 methodology as outlined in my report, by definition, 8 these quantities represent actual quantities and 9 prices that were paid by consumers among the 10 at-issue drugs in the at-issue time period for the 11 at-issue payors.</p> <p>12 Q Right.</p> <p>13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, the 14 at-issue...</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Payors.</p> <p>16 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: The prices for 18 consumers.</p> <p>19 BY MR. ABRAHAM:</p> <p>20 Q But, Dr. Conti, I just want to make 21 sure, there's no place I can look in your report 22 that would tell me what the price and quantity 23 numbers are that you used for those two 24 calculations; is that fair?</p> <p>25 A Well, what we're providing -- what I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 prospectively.</p> <p>2 Q Does your damages analysis address in 3 any way the impact of the recall upon damages to 4 either the end-payor or consumer classes?</p> <p>5 A Just in terms of the time period that 6 was used.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Do you know who Hetero's U.S. 8 repackager or distributor was in the chain of 9 comments?</p> <p>10 A Not off the top of my head, no.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Do you know what payments, if 12 any, were made by that repackager or distributor --</p> <p>13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, can 14 you repeat that? Can you repeat that?</p> <p>15 MR. ABRAHAM: Sure.</p> <p>16 BY MR. ABRAHAM:</p> <p>17 Q Do you know what payments, if any, 18 were made by the repackager or distributor of 19 Hetero's product to any party in the chain of 20 distribution as a result of the recall?</p> <p>21 A I'm sorry, I don't completely 22 understand. What do you mean -- do you mean 23 distributor of the wholesale distributor, just to be 24 specific?</p> <p>25 Q Let's take -- let's take that example.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 providing in my report is the conjunction, price 2 times quantity. I'm more than happy to provide you 3 the -- I think what you're asking for is what is the 4 native price and quantity for each -- for Hetero 5 underlying the consumer damages listed here. And, 6 again, it's in my data. I'm more than happy to 7 provide it to you.</p> <p>8 Q Thank you.</p> <p>9 MR. ABRAHAM: I'll make that request, 10 please, of your counsel, to provide me with the 11 quantity and price that went into your 12 end-payor damages and consumer damages 13 calculations. I appreciate that.</p> <p>14 BY MR. ABRAHAM:</p> <p>15 Q Do you know the quantity of Hetero's 16 valsartan that was recalled as a result of the 17 allegedly impure nature of the pills?</p> <p>18 A No. And, again, it was of no moment 19 in my analysis because -- because of the significant 20 asymmetric information and the perspective of my 21 analysis, which was prospectively from the consumer 22 and third-party payors' perspective. They had no 23 ability to know which products were recalled versus 24 which ones were not -- or which ones were 25 contaminated versus which ones were not,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 A Yeah. Okay. So -- and are you asking 2 about payments that Hetero made to their distributor 3 or --</p> <p>4 Q I mean --</p> <p>5 A -- to other --</p> <p>6 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. I cannot 7 -- I can't have you both speaking at one time. 8 It's too fast, and I can't do it.</p> <p>9 MR. ABRAHAM: Sorry. My fault.</p> <p>10 BY THE WITNESS:</p> <p>11 Q I mean, not necessarily payments made 12 by Hetero's manufacturer, but made by Hetero's 13 United States repackager or distributor.</p> <p>14 A So do you mean that there were -- 15 there were refunds that were made by the distributor 16 to consumers or to third-party payors for recalled 17 products?</p> <p>18 Q That's a fair hypothetical. So in 19 other words, yes. Did you, in any way in your 20 damages analysis, consider if those had occurred and 21 what the impact would be in your damages 22 calculation?</p> <p>23 A So, again, my -- my damage calculation 24 is flexible and could accommodate the possibility of 25 refunds that were made for recalled or contaminated</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p> <p>1 product to end-payors. I did not have that data for 2 this analysis that I conducted. My understanding is 3 that whether or not that would be ultimately 4 included in damages for settlement purposes, that is 5 something that would be settled by counsel, court or 6 the judge.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Did your damages analysis in 8 any way address the charge backs, rebates, bill 9 backs, administrative fees or cash discounts 10 attributable to sales of Hetero's valsartan that was 11 allegedly contaminated or unpure as a result of the 12 nitrosamine?</p> <p>13 A That's a really compound question. So 14 let's take that apart.</p> <p>15 So if discounts were given to 16 consumers at the point of sale, then by definition, 17 they are included in my damages because they would 18 offset the actual payment that patients made at the 19 pharmacy counter. And that would be included in the 20 IQVIA data that's listed in my report.</p> <p>21 Q Did you analysis -- I'm sorry. Go 22 ahead. I didn't mean to interrupt.</p> <p>23 A No. It's okay.</p> <p>24 We don't have rebate data. That is 25 something that is confidential and available from</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p> <p>1 witness. Thank you very much for your time.</p> <p>2 MR. HONIK: Eric, but for the benefit 3 of the record, I just would like to note that 4 the backup data that you asked of Dr. Conti 5 that pertains to Hetero and Table 1, the 6 aggregate of damages, was provided to you and 7 all defense counsel concomitantly with our 8 serving our class cert motion and brief. So if 9 you'll do nothing more than look at the files 10 that we served, you'll find the data points 11 that you're looking for there.</p> <p>12 MR. ABRAHAM: Let's have this 13 discussion offline. I don't want to consume 14 the doctor's time.</p> <p>15 MR. HONIK: Understood. I wanted the 16 record to reflect that it's already been served 17 on counsel.</p> <p>18 Next -- next up?</p> <p>19 MR. KNEPPER: Yes. This is 20 Matthew Knepper from Husch Blackwell. I will 21 go next.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. From where?</p> <p>23 MR. KNEPPER: Husch Blackwell. I 24 represent Express Scripts.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: -- as the pharmacy, just</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p> <p>1 the manufacturers themselves. From a theory of 2 liability, rebates are not necessarily things that 3 would be considered to be offsets, because injury 4 occurs at the point of sale, and rebates are paid 5 after the products are sold at some other point in 6 time in aggregate and may not be directly related to 7 any specific transaction.</p> <p>8 But to the extent that Hetero or their 9 agents negotiated prices with third-party payors, 10 that varied by product, they would be in the IQVIA 11 data. Because, by definition, the IQVIA data is 12 providing the price that was actually paid by the 13 third-party at the pharmacy counter for those 14 products.</p> <p>15 So if discounts were given, if Hetero 16 gave discounts to, I don't know, let's say, take one 17 of the third-party payors in this case, 18 prospectively, that would be in my calculation -- in 19 the damages that are calculated here.</p> <p>20 THE COURT REPORTER: And what?</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: That would be in the 22 damages that are calculated here.</p> <p>23 MR. ABRAHAM: Okay. Subject to 24 receiving the information that you agreed to 25 provide, I have no further questions for the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 169</p> <p>1 so I understand.</p> <p>2 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I can't hear you.</p> <p>4 THE COURT REPORTER: What was your 5 last question to Mr. Knepper?</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: As the pharmacy benefit 7 manager or as the mail order pharmacy?</p> <p>8 MR. KNEPPER: As the pharmacy -- the 9 defendant in this case.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Thank you so much for 11 that clarification.</p> <p>12 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>13 Q So I'd like to turn to Page 32 in your 14 report, Table 3. This is "Aggregate Retailer Unjust 15 Enrichment Damages." Dr. Conti, the dollar figures 16 reflected in Table 3 for unjust enrichment damages 17 represent your calculation of the profits each 18 pharmacy defendant had from the sale of at-issue 19 valsartan, right?</p> <p>20 A Correct.</p> <p>21 Q These dollar figures actually reflect 22 the retail pharmacies' profits if the pharmacies 23 obtained the drug for free, right?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>2 Q Can you show me where in your 3 report -- well, let me strike that.</p> <p>4 Earlier, we talked about dispensing 5 fees and how those were removed from -- you said 6 removed from the dispensing data produced from the 7 retail pharmacies, right?</p> <p>8 THE COURT REPORTER: From the what?</p> <p>9 MR. KNEPPER: From the retail 10 pharmacies' data.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Earlier when, sir?</p> <p>12 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>13 Q Earlier in the deposition when you 14 were talking to Ms. Kapke.</p> <p>15 A Sorry, who's Ms. Kathy?</p> <p>16 Q Ms. Kapke, Kara, who questioned you 17 this morning.</p> <p>18 A You mean for CVS?</p> <p>19 Q Correct.</p> <p>20 A I am following you now. Thank you for 21 the clarification.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. You said that you removed or -- 23 or took into account the fact that what you called 24 dispensing fees were not included in the data that 25 was provided by the retail pharmacy defendants in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: That is of no moment in 3 my analysis, sir.</p> <p>4 MR. KNEPPER: Okay. Let's go to 5 Paragraph 64, if we could.</p> <p>6 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Before I ask about 8 Paragraph 64, in your experience in this industry, 9 would you agree that, before a pharmacy can dispense 10 a medication, it has to purchase either a finished 11 dose or the active ingredient?</p> <p>12 A Well, most pharmacies, in my 13 understanding, have significant stores of 14 prescription drugs already available for dispensing. 15 Walgreens, for example, and CVS is moving millions 16 of prescriptions per day through the U.S. supply 17 chain. So those things are not stocked in an 18 instantaneous way. They are stocked in a warehouse 19 and ready to be dispensed immediately when consumers 20 come, especially among generic drugs as frequently 21 used as the ones at-issue here.</p> <p>22 Q All right. Is it your understanding 23 that the medication that you just referenced, stored 24 in Walgreens' warehouse, had to be at one time 25 purchased by Walgreens and stored in that warehouse?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 this case. Do you remember that?</p> <p>2 A That's not what I said, sir. That's a 3 mischaracterization of my testimony.</p> <p>4 Q Well, we will go -- I'm not -- I'm not 5 trying to be controversial. We can go to page -- or 6 Paragraph 78 of the report?</p> <p>7 A No. I mean, why don't we just go to 8 the methodology for calculation of unjust enrichment 9 in --</p> <p>10 Q Let's go to Page 78 first.</p> <p>11 A -- Paragraph 64 --</p> <p>12 Q Let's go to Paragraph 78.</p> <p>13 THE COURT REPORTER: I can't do this.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: In Paragraph 64, where I 15 explain that -- that dispensing fees to 16 consumers were removed from the calculation, 17 the retailer unjust enrichment claims that were 18 enumerated by -- offset by pharmacies in 19 Table 3.</p> <p>20 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Other than the statement that 22 the -- the dispensing fees were removed, where in 23 your report are you taking into account the fact 24 that these pharmacies had to pay for the medication 25 before they dispensed it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 A How is that in any moment to me, sir?</p> <p>2 Q Is that a yes? I need to know. Do 3 you agree that Walgreens would have to purchase the 4 drug, or do you believe that they get it for free?</p> <p>5 A It's not something, sir, that I 6 considered -- it's not in my report. Nowhere do I 7 talk about the purchasing of these products by these 8 retail pharmacies, because that is not of moment.</p> <p>9 The only thing that is of moment to my 10 analysis is that injury occurred at the point of 11 sale, and the only cost at the point of sale that is 12 relevant is the dispensing fee, which you, the 13 retailer, has already taken out of the data. So by 14 definition, you have already -- you have already 15 said that, yes, that is the cost to you for each 16 individual prescription that you moved out of your 17 store. You took it out.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. I'm going to move forward. 19 This is not my line of questioning.</p> <p>20 Paragraph 63 that you referenced and 21 64, Paragraph 63 says, "Retailers profited from the 22 sale of the at-issue valsartan," all right? And 23 profits are defined as revenue minus costs.</p> <p>24 And so what I'm asking you about is 25 how you calculated the profit that is contained in</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 174		Page 176
1	Table 3. And what I understand --	1	answered.
2	A I --	2	THE WITNESS: Sir, I'm going to use
3	Q I'm not done with my question.	3	the -- I'm going to walk you through this as
4	What I understand is that you took the	4	best as I possibly can, and simply, so I think
5	revenue that was reflected as being paid by -- the	5	it will be very clear.
6	patient responsibility, and you added that up by	6	We asked the pharmacies what their
7	state. And then you note that the dispensing fee is	7	profits were, the revenue from the products
8	not present, but unless you're going to tell me	8	that they sold and their cost. Each retailer
9	there's some other data about the cost to acquire	9	provided us with only the revenues they
10	the data that you can speak of the drugs that you	10	received from consumer payments, not the amount
11	considered, I don't see where you considered the	11	of money that they received from the
12	cost of purchasing the drug. So can you explain	12	third-party payors, which by definition, would
13	where that is in your report?	13	be larger than the consumers in this case.
14	MR. HONIK: Object -- hold on a	14	Instead, the retailers limited the
15	second.	15	data that they produced to just the payments
16	Object to form. Asked and answered.	16	that the consumers paid in the form of
17	You may answer.	17	co-insurance and co-payments. The retailers
18	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	18	also only provided to us information about
19	The retail pharmacies subtracted the	19	that -- the cost that they viewed as being
20	fee, their costs for dispensing the product at	20	relevant were the dispensing costs.
21	the point of sale. From their --	21	BY MR. KNEPPER:
22	Q I'm not talking about --	22	Q I thought you said that --
23	MR. HONIK: You cannot interrupt --	23	A Excuse me. Hold on, please, sir.
24	you cannot interrupt the witness.	24	Please let me finish.
25	MR. KNEPPER: I'm limited on time.	25	Q That was a long pause.
	Page 175		Page 177
1	MR. HONIK: In doesn't matter.	1	A Therefore -- therefore, I calculated
2	MR. KNEPPER: She is answering a	2	the profits as a function of revenue minus cost,
3	question I am not asking.	3	where the retailers only provided the payments that
4	MR. HONIK: You're not permitted to	4	were made by consumers minus the costs that they
5	cut off the witness. If you -- we can stop the	5	provided, that they consented to were -- that were
6	deposition. That's up to you, but you can't --	6	the dispensing costs. From my perspective, those
7	you can't prevent her from answering.	7	are the costs of dispensing a prescription to an
8	MR. KNEPPER: Proceed.	8	individual patient.
9	THE WITNESS: Can you please read back	9	Q So can you point to a treatise that
10	the question?	10	supports the idea that you can calculate retail
11	MR. KNEPPER: I'm going to ask you a	11	pharmacy profits without including a cost of -- that
12	different one.	12	the pharmacy spent to procure the goods? Can you
13	BY MR. KNEPPER:	13	point to that treatise?
14	Q Can you cite --	14	A This is the retailers' data. It's
15	MR. HONIK: Are you withdrawing the	15	on -- it's on the retailers to provide a treatise to
16	question?	16	support their subtraction of -- or accounting of
17	MR. KNEPPER: I'm withdrawing the	17	only the dispensing cost. It's not on me. Injury
18	question.	18	occurs at the point of sale. So it's the only thing
19	MR. HONIK: Thank you.	19	that matters at the point of sale.
20	BY MR. KNEPPER:	20	Q To calculate profit?
21	Q Can you cite any piece of literature	21	A From the retailers' own perspective.
22	to support your idea that one can calculate retail	22	That is not -- has nothing to do with my
23	pharmacy profits without including, as a cost, the	23	perspective. That is the retailers' data that was
24	pharmacy's cost from actually procuring the goods?	24	provided to me.
25	MR. HONIK: Objection, asked and	25	Q All right. The --

45 (Pages 174 - 177)

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-227-8440

973-410-4040

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?</p> <p>2 MR. KNEPPER: I was talking to myself.</p> <p>3 Withdraw that. Or strike it.</p> <p>4 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>5 Q I'm going to take it that, sitting</p> <p>6 here today, you are not going to name a piece of</p> <p>7 literature or treatise that will support the idea</p> <p>8 that you can calculate the -- the profits of a</p> <p>9 pharmacy if you don't include the amount of money</p> <p>10 that the pharmacy spent procuring the goods?</p> <p>11 MR. HONIK: Object to form. It's been</p> <p>12 asked and answered. It's painfully clear that</p> <p>13 you don't understand, and I -- I -- she can't</p> <p>14 answer it any differently.</p> <p>15 MR. KNEPPER: Okay. Then we'll move</p> <p>16 on. I withdraw the question. I withdraw the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I don't --</p> <p>19 MR. KNEPPER: I'm withdrawing the</p> <p>20 question.</p> <p>21 THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear</p> <p>22 anybody. I hear nobody.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I don't -- are you</p> <p>24 withdrawing the question and striking the</p> <p>25 question? Because I'm more than happy to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 dispensing. I believe earlier you testified --</p> <p>2 A No, that's not --</p> <p>3 Q I'm not done asking my question.</p> <p>4 Earlier, you testified that a pharmacy</p> <p>5 sets the dispensing fee. And I want to clarify my</p> <p>6 understanding as -- in this industry is that</p> <p>7 typically, the dispensing fee is set by a PBM as</p> <p>8 part of the network agreement. Is that true?</p> <p>9 A That is not my understanding because</p> <p>10 there are many, many dispensing prescription drugs</p> <p>11 that have nothing to do with a pharmacy benefit</p> <p>12 manager.</p> <p>13 Q I don't understand that answer.</p> <p>14 MR. HONIK: Are you just going to make</p> <p>15 comments and speak to yourself and create a</p> <p>16 record?</p> <p>17 MR. KNEPPER: Is that an objection?</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: That's what you're</p> <p>19 doing.</p> <p>20 MR. HONIK: That's what you're doing.</p> <p>21 You're just -- it's like a color commentary to</p> <p>22 the testimony. You're here and permitted to</p> <p>23 ask a question and receive an answer. That's</p> <p>24 it. You're not supposed to -- you know, reveal</p> <p>25 your own befuddlement at the answers.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 answer your question.</p> <p>2 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>3 Q No, I'm going to withdraw.</p> <p>4 I feel like if there was a treatise</p> <p>5 available, or treatise or an article or piece of</p> <p>6 literature to support it, you would have named it.</p> <p>7 I'm going to move forward.</p> <p>8 MR. HONIK: Move to strike. That's</p> <p>9 not a -- excuse me. That's not a question.</p> <p>10 You can't testify.</p> <p>11 MR. KNEPPER: Got it.</p> <p>12 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>13 Q You understand that a dispensing fee</p> <p>14 is typically set by a pharmacy benefit manager as</p> <p>15 part of a pharmacy being in that pharmacy benefit</p> <p>16 manager's network, right?</p> <p>17 MR. HONIK: Objection, asked and</p> <p>18 answered.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: That is not my</p> <p>20 answer -- that is not my understanding, sir.</p> <p>21 There are many, many transactions here that</p> <p>22 have nothing to do with the existence of a</p> <p>23 pharmacy benefit manager.</p> <p>24 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>25 Q I asked about the setting of a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>2 Q Under the -- you went -- in order to</p> <p>3 calculate your damages model, I believe earlier you</p> <p>4 said you tallied up the total amount of patient</p> <p>5 responsibilities by state. And then you put on the</p> <p>6 charts other and attached it to your report, right?</p> <p>7 That's how you got to the full amount of damages?</p> <p>8 A I don't understand your question.</p> <p>9 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>10 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>11 Q Are you aware that in some</p> <p>12 circumstances a pharmacy might end up actually being</p> <p>13 reimbursed less than the amount it paid to acquire a</p> <p>14 drug?</p> <p>15 MR. HONIK: Object to form, asked and</p> <p>16 answered.</p> <p>17 You can respond.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I don't understand the</p> <p>19 question, sir.</p> <p>20 BY MR. KNEPPER:</p> <p>21 Q Are you aware as an -- as someone who</p> <p>22 is familiar with the industry and these</p> <p>23 circumstances, which -- because of the reimbursement</p> <p>24 that is offered by a third-party payor otherwise,</p> <p>25 that a pharmacy may end up receiving less than the</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 182</p> <p>1 amount indicated in the expense to acquire the drug?</p> <p>2 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, asked</p> <p>3 and answered. Are you referring to pre- and</p> <p>4 post-point of sale transactions?</p> <p>5 MR. KNEPPER: I mean, I'm asking the</p> <p>6 question.</p> <p>7 MR. HONIK: She answered you. She</p> <p>8 said she doesn't --</p> <p>9 MR. KNEPPER: No, you answered it.</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: No, I didn't answer it.</p> <p>11 MR. KNEPPER: You answered another</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 MR. HONIK: She didn't understand your</p> <p>14 question. I'm trying -- I'm trying to help</p> <p>15 you.</p> <p>16 MR. KNEPPER: I'm going to stop.</p> <p>17 MR. HONIK: Okay.</p> <p>18 MR. OSTFELD: I think that means I'm</p> <p>19 up.</p> <p>20 EXAMINATION BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>21 Q Good afternoon, Doctor.</p> <p>22 THE COURT REPORTER: Hold on. Who's</p> <p>23 going next?</p> <p>24 MR. OSTFELD: This is Greg Ostfeld --</p> <p>25 THE COURT REPORTER: Hold on.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 184</p> <p>1 manufacturers like Teva, did you make any</p> <p>2 adjustments to account for differences in different</p> <p>3 states, measures and damages?</p> <p>4 MR. HONIK: Note my objection, asked</p> <p>5 and answered. And to the extent it calls for a</p> <p>6 legal conclusion, I further object.</p> <p>7 But you may answer.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: We have already talked</p> <p>9 about this numerous times. So the theories of</p> <p>10 liability and unjust enrichment are by</p> <p>11 definition state specific. And therefore, the</p> <p>12 calculations are, for each of the damage</p> <p>13 calculations that are presented in my report,</p> <p>14 are month, year, product and state specific.</p> <p>15 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And those calculations are</p> <p>17 agnostic with respect to the state law measure of</p> <p>18 damage for each state, correct?</p> <p>19 MR. HONIK: Object to the form, asked</p> <p>20 and answered.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Again, my understanding</p> <p>22 is that they are based on instruction from</p> <p>23 counsel.</p> <p>24 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So when you get instructions</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 183</p> <p>1 MR. OSTFELD: -- from Greenberg</p> <p>2 Taurig.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I'd like to</p> <p>4 take a break. I'll take five minutes, please.</p> <p>5 MR. HONIK: Okay.</p> <p>6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:34.</p> <p>7 We're going off the record.</p> <p>8 (Whereupon, a short break was taken.)</p> <p>9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:40.</p> <p>10 We're back on the record.</p> <p>11 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>12 Q Good afternoon, Dr. Conti. My name's</p> <p>13 Greg Ostfeld. And I represent the Teva group of</p> <p>14 defendants, which includes both Teva and Actavis.</p> <p>15 The good news is you're almost done.</p> <p>16 So --</p> <p>17 A I hope you don't yell at me like the</p> <p>18 previous attorney, or bully me.</p> <p>19 Q I'm not a yeller, Dr. Conti.</p> <p>20 A That sounds good.</p> <p>21 Q I mean, if we can try to be nice to</p> <p>22 each other for the last 15 minutes, we can end on an</p> <p>23 upbeat note going into the weekend.</p> <p>24 A Okay.</p> <p>25 Q When you calculated damages for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 185</p> <p>1 from counsel, the court or a jury, that would be</p> <p>2 when you would make adjustments to account for</p> <p>3 state-specific differences?</p> <p>4 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I think I'm a little</p> <p>6 confused.</p> <p>7 What I'm saying is, my damage</p> <p>8 calculations that are presented in this report</p> <p>9 are already adjusted for state-specific issues.</p> <p>10 And there might be additional adjustments that</p> <p>11 are made. My method is flexible to account for</p> <p>12 them and would be up to the court or the jury</p> <p>13 to decide.</p> <p>14 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>15 Q All right. In my client's case, you</p> <p>16 calculated separate damages for their generic</p> <p>17 versions of Diovan and Exforge; is that right?</p> <p>18 THE COURT REPORTER: Diovan and -- I'm</p> <p>19 sorry.</p> <p>20 MR. OSTFELD: Exforge.</p> <p>21 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. Uh-huh.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: That is my</p> <p>23 understanding, yes.</p> <p>24 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Now, the brand-name versions of</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 those two drugs, those were not adulterated or 2 misbranded under the assumptions you've applied to 3 your method, correct?</p> <p>4 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I don't understand. I'm 6 sorry.</p> <p>7 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>8 Q That's okay. You were not asked to 9 assume that brand-name Diovan was adulterated or 10 misbranded for purposes of your analysis of this 11 case, correct?</p> <p>12 A So the products that are at issue are 13 enumerated in Footnote 3 and discussed in -- at 14 length in the complaint. The attorneys, the 15 counsel, gave me the NDC codes and the month, years 16 at issue. And that's what was applied to the data 17 that I got from IQVIA or to the retailers as we've 18 already discussed at length.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. And you have not applied the 20 assumptions of adulteration or misbranding to any 21 other forms of valsartan beyond those that 22 were -- that you just described that are delineated 23 in your footnote and that were provided to you by 24 counsel by NDC code?</p> <p>25 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 different assumption from the assumption that you 2 made in preparing your analysis in this case.</p> <p>3 Plaintiffs' counsel asked you to make one 4 assumption, I'm going to now ask you to make a 5 different one.</p> <p>6 I will ask you to assume, for the 7 purposes of my next few questions -- and I know you 8 don't love hypotheticals. But we're talking about 9 assumptions here, so I'm going to have to ask you to 10 make a few.</p> <p>11 So I will ask you to assume, for 12 purposes of my next questions, that some 13 manufacturers' versions of generic valsartan were 14 not adulterated and/or not misbranded. Okay?</p> <p>15 That's the assumption I'm asking you to make. The 16 question is coming.</p> <p>17 A In what time period, sir?</p> <p>18 Q During the same time period that the 19 at-issue valsartan was being sold.</p> <p>20 A Okay. And they were in the retail 21 profit trade in the U.S.?</p> <p>22 Q Yes.</p> <p>23 A And their non-contamination was known 24 by the manufacturer and also communicated to the 25 FDA?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Again, counsel provided 2 me the list of NDC codes. We picked up a 3 number of additional NDC codes that were 4 repackaged or private-labeled but were related 5 to the upstream at-issue products, and then 6 applied that forward to the calculation.</p> <p>7 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>8 Q All right. During the same time 9 period that the at-issue valsartan was sold, did 10 brand-name Diovan have a legitimate supply curve?</p> <p>11 A Again, my opinion related to the 12 legitimate supply curve is related to the products 13 at-issue.</p> <p>14 Q Right. And that's all I'm asking you. 15 For one of the products that's not at issue, 16 brand-name Diovan, did it have a legitimate supply 17 curve?</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: Object to the form. It's 19 been asked and answered, and it's beyond the 20 scope.</p> <p>21 You may respond.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't quite 23 understand your question. I'm sorry.</p> <p>24 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>25 Q Okay. I'm going to ask you to make a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 Q That -- sure. We can make that 2 assumption as well.</p> <p>3 A And it was also asserted to or 4 attested to by those manufacturers to the 5 Food and Drug Administration and the downstream 6 consumers?</p> <p>7 Q That they were not adulterated and not 8 misbranded, yes. You can make that assumption as 9 well.</p> <p>10 A Great. And those attestations were 11 not incorrect, in fact?</p> <p>12 Q That is -- that is the assumption I'm 13 asking to you make, yes.</p> <p>14 A Okay. Just trying to understand 15 exactly what contours of the hypothetical are.</p> <p>16 Q Absolutely. I like that you are 17 precise, and I want to make sure you have a good set 18 of assumptions. So you're comfortable with those 19 assumptions?</p> <p>20 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I'll let you know if I 22 have other questions.</p> <p>23 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Using the assumptions that 25 we've just agreed to, would it be your opinion that</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 190	Page 191	Page 192
1 there was a legitimate supply curve for 2 non-adulterated, non-misbranded, generic valsartan 3 drugs, applying all of the assumptions you just 4 made?		1 payors? 2 A I just asked you about the condition 3 of asymmetric information. If -- if consumers and 4 third-party payors, plus the regulator, all knew the 5 exact same information that the manufacturer did 6 regarding the purity, strength, adulteration or 7 non-adulteration, non-misbranding, et cetera, if the 8 product was exactly what it said it was or what was 9 represented, and every consumer and third-party 10 payor had full transparency over that, then, yes, 11 prospectively, that would make absolute sense that 12 there was full economic value.
5 A Yes, from a -- from a prospective form 6 perspective, if the products were not adulterated, 7 not misbranded and -- and were cGMP compliant in 8 their material production, and met all of the rest 9 of the FDA requirements, safety, efficacy, purity, 10 et cetera, then yes, correct. They would be a -- 11 there is a legitimate supply curve for those 12 products.	13 Q And would that apply retrospectively, 14 as well, to the products that were already sold and 15 ingested?	13 Q Okay.
16 A No.	17 Q And why not?	14 A We, of course, don't live in a world 15 of full information.
18 A Because my analysis is a prospective 19 one, not a retrospective one.	20 Q Understood.	16 Q Okay. I understand that you have 17 relied on the allegations of the complaint 18 referenced in Footnote 1 in the first paragraph of 19 your report as the basis for your assumption of 20 adulteration and misbranding; is that correct?
21 So your analysis could not apply 22 retrospectively. Understood.	23 A No. That's not what I said, sir. 24 That's not my testimony.	21 A I'm sorry. There's a -- there's 22 numerous things that you said in that sentence, 23 so --
25 Q Okay. That's okay. I'll move on.		24 Q Okay. I guess what I'm trying to -- 25 I'm not asking to you repeat testimony, but I want
1 Under the same changed assumptions 2 that we just agreed to, would you agree that 3 non-adulterated, non-misbranded, generic valsartan 4 drugs have economic value as well as therapeutic 5 value?	13 BY MR. OSTFELD:	1 to make sure I accurately understand your earlier 2 testimony.
6 MR. HONIK: Object to the form.	14 Q Okay. I'll exclude therapeutic value 15 from my question.	3 I think I understood you earlier to 4 testify that the basis for your assumption that the 5 at-issue valsartan was adulterated and misbranded, 6 is what is contained in the complaint in this case; 7 is that correct?
7 THE WITNESS: I have no opinion on 8 therapeutic value. It was not of any moment in 9 my analysis because therapeutic value is -- is 10 related to the demand curve. And I'm not 11 analyzing the demand curve here. I'm focused 12 on the supply curve.	16 Under the same assumptions that we 17 just agreed to, would you agree that 18 non-adulterated, non-misbranded generic valsartan 19 drugs have economic value?	8 MR. HONIK: Object to form, 9 mischaracterizes the testimony. You can 10 respond.
20 A In -- where there was no asymmetric 21 information?	11 THE WITNESS: As instructed by counsel 12 and laid out in my report, yes.	11 THE WITNESS: As instructed by counsel 12 and laid out in my report, yes.
22 Q Correct.	13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I've 14 been instructed by counsel...	13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I've 14 been instructed by counsel...
23 A Yes.	15 MR. HONIK: As instructed.	15 MR. HONIK: As instructed.
24 Q And that economic value was true --	16 THE WITNESS: As instructed by counsel 17 and laid out in my report.	16 THE WITNESS: As instructed by counsel 17 and laid out in my report.
25 would be true of both consumers and third-party	18 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.	18 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
	19 BY MR. OSTFELD:	19 BY MR. OSTFELD:
	20 Q Other than the complaint, is there any 21 other basis on which you have relied for your 22 assumption that the at-issue valsartan of my 23 clients, Teva, was adulterated and misbranded?	20 Q Other than the complaint, is there any 21 other basis on which you have relied for your 22 assumption that the at-issue valsartan of my 23 clients, Teva, was adulterated and misbranded?
	24 MR. HONIK: Object to form, asked and 25 answered.	24 MR. HONIK: Object to form, asked and 25 answered.

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 194</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Well, I think we've 2 already talked about this, that the FDA had 3 very -- there was a lot of communications about 4 the products at-issue and the contamination, 5 which includes discussions of the contamination 6 and the recall for the Teva-specific products.</p> <p>7 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>8 Q Do you have any personal knowledge of 9 whether Teva's valsartan was adulterated or 10 misbranded?</p> <p>11 A Define "personal knowledge," sir.</p> <p>12 Q Is it your opinion that Teva violated 13 good -- current good manufacturing practices?</p> <p>14 MR. HONIK: Object to form.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I mean, we talked about 16 this earlier. I'd be more than happy to go 17 through what the FDA said. It's --</p> <p>18 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. What 19 was just said?</p> <p>20 MR. OSTFELD: Guys, somebody needs to 21 mute.</p> <p>22 MR. HONIK: It's Eric Abraham.</p> <p>23 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. So we 24 talked about this earlier. I'm more than happy 25 to go through what the FDA said...</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 196</p> <p>1 this case an original document that you prepared 2 specifically for this case?</p> <p>3 MR. HONIK: Object to form. What do 4 you mean by "original"?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't 6 understand what that means.</p> <p>7 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>8 Q Are there any parts of your 9 declaration in this case that you copied or adapted 10 from another report in your case?</p> <p>11 A What other case?</p> <p>12 Q I'm asking you. Are there any parts 13 of your declaration in this case that you copied or 14 adapted from an earlier report in another case?</p> <p>15 A I'm asking you to be specific, sir.</p> <p>16 Q Any case, any report in any other 17 case.</p> <p>18 A I mean, I'm happy to go through and 19 look. Certainly, there are parts of my 20 qualifications that are pretty standard. So if we 21 can go through -- so we go -- I'm answering your 22 question, sir.</p> <p>23 Q I'm not asking you to go through your 24 report. I'm asking --</p> <p>25 A I have asked you for specifics several</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 195</p> <p>1 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>2 Q Doctor, I'll withdraw my question. I 3 see that I'm running short on time, and there's one 4 more topic I wanted to cover.</p> <p>5 MR. HONIK: I think there's only a 6 minute or so left.</p> <p>7 MR. OSTFELD: I think 2:45 is what 8 I've got on my timer.</p> <p>9 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>10 Q You told Mr. Goldberg yesterday that 11 you wrote your declaration in this case. Did you 12 write the entire declaration?</p> <p>13 A I'm sorry, is that a compound 14 question?</p> <p>15 Q No. I'm asking, did you write your 16 entire declaration in this case? It's one question.</p> <p>17 A Are you asking me about what I said to 18 Mr. Goldberg?</p> <p>19 Q I'm asking you a separate question. 20 Did you write your entire declaration in this case?</p> <p>21 A I wrote my declaration in this case.</p> <p>22 Q Did anyone else draft any --</p> <p>23 A Hold on. With the assistance of my 24 staff.</p> <p>25 Q All right. Is your declaration in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p> <p>1 times. You --</p> <p>2 Q All right. Well, I'm going to 3 withdraw my question.</p> <p>4 A -- and now I'm going to try to answer 5 it.</p> <p>6 Q I'm going to withdraw my question, and 7 ask you a more specific question.</p> <p>8 You previously prepared an expert 9 report in Blue Cross Blue Shield Association versus 10 GlaxoSmithKline?</p> <p>11 A I'm sorry, what case is that, sir?</p> <p>12 Q Blue Cross Blue Shield Association 13 versus GlaxoSmithKline.</p> <p>14 A Can you refer to me in my CV which 15 case that is?</p> <p>16 Q Did you copy or adapt portions of your 17 expert report in this case from your report in 18 Blue Cross Blue Shield Association versus 19 GlaxoSmithKline?</p> <p>20 A I'm asking you which specific case is 21 that. Can you point to me in my CV or in my 22 declaration what case that is?</p> <p>23 MR. HONIK: Excuse me. Or 24 alternatively, show the witness the other document, and she will compare it and answer</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 your question, either way.</p> <p>2 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>3 Q That is the name of the case in your</p> <p>4 CV, ma'am.</p> <p>5 A Okay. So show me where it is in my</p> <p>6 CV.</p> <p>7 Q I don't have your CV in front of me,</p> <p>8 but let me pull it up.</p> <p>9 A Okay.</p> <p>10 Q If you look on Page 5 of your CV, the</p> <p>11 second to last --</p> <p>12 A Give me a second to get there.</p> <p>13 Page 5. Okay. So there are multiple reports, June,</p> <p>14 August, September 2018. Blue Cross Blue Shield</p> <p>15 Association et al. versus GlaxoSmithKline. Is that</p> <p>16 the one you're talking about?</p> <p>17 Q That is the case that I'm talking</p> <p>18 about.</p> <p>19 A And it says, "Written reports," with</p> <p>20 an S, "and deposition," correct?</p> <p>21 Q Correct.</p> <p>22 A Okay. So as I mentioned before,</p> <p>23 before you interrupted me, my qualifications don't</p> <p>24 change much. So I'm assuming if we go to Page 4 of</p> <p>25 this report, of the current report, I expect that</p>	<p>Page 198</p> <p>1 also provided in my CV.</p> <p>2 17 probably hasn't changed so much.</p> <p>3 18 definitely has changed. 19 may or may not</p> <p>4 be in that report. Then we can go through the</p> <p>5 institutional background on the regulation.</p> <p>6 BY MR. OSTFELD:</p> <p>7 Q Okay.</p> <p>8 A So that other case was also a cGMP</p> <p>9 case, and many of the institutions are obviously the</p> <p>10 same. Probably, there is overlap.</p> <p>11 Q To complete this exercise, would it be</p> <p>12 helpful to you if I put the other report in so you</p> <p>13 can compare them side-by-side?</p> <p>14 A I mean, there are actually multiple</p> <p>15 reports, and there's a deposition. So which -- I'd</p> <p>16 like to see them all.</p> <p>17 Q Well, I only have one, but I'll put it</p> <p>18 on the screen. And if you --</p> <p>19 A I'm sorry. If you're going to provide</p> <p>20 new information to me and ask me to compare and</p> <p>21 contrast and go through, then I'd like to see them</p> <p>22 all.</p> <p>23 Q Dr. Conti, I only have one. I can</p> <p>24 only give you what I have.</p> <p>25 A Then I think -- then I think that we</p>
<p>1 Paragraph 12 and probably Paragraph 13, probably</p> <p>2 Paragraph 14, in whole or in part -- I think that</p> <p>3 changed a little over time. Certainly Paragraph 15</p> <p>4 has changed over time, because I've added that I've</p> <p>5 been a consultant for the FDA's office of generic</p> <p>6 drugs, that I'm currently serving as an ad hoc</p> <p>7 advisor to the national finance -- advisor to the</p> <p>8 Engineering invention -- Medicine's Committee on the</p> <p>9 security --</p> <p>10 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, one</p> <p>11 more -- you're serving as an ad hoc advisor to</p> <p>12 the...</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I am currently serving</p> <p>14 as an ad hoc advisor to the National Academy of</p> <p>15 Sciences, Engineering and Medicine's Committee</p> <p>16 on Security of America's Medical Supply --</p> <p>17 Product Supply Change. That's new.</p> <p>18 So 16 has definitely been updated to</p> <p>19 reflect the fact that I was -- that I have</p> <p>20 submitted testimony in another cGMP violation</p> <p>21 matter, which is the case that we were just</p> <p>22 talking about, the Blue Cross Blue Shield</p> <p>23 versus GlaxoSmithKline case. But also, that</p> <p>24 I've been involved in a variety of other cases</p> <p>25 since that case concluded. That information is</p>	<p>Page 199</p> <p>Page 200</p> <p>1 don't have enough time to do this, in all fairness.</p> <p>2 I'm more than happy to go through, line-by-line, my</p> <p>3 report and other reports. But, you know, if you're</p> <p>4 going to refer me to the reports that I -- that I</p> <p>5 wrote for the center case, I want to do them all,</p> <p>6 not just one, and not just cherry pick things that</p> <p>7 might be convenient for you, but everything.</p> <p>8 MR. HONIK: Yeah. And I think our</p> <p>9 time is up. Justin, can you report to us where</p> <p>10 we are?</p> <p>11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Do you want me to</p> <p>12 go off the record and do that?</p> <p>13 MR. HONIK: Sure, off the record.</p> <p>14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off</p> <p>15 the record. The time is 5:00 p.m.</p> <p>16 (Whereupon, a discussion was held off</p> <p>17 the record.)</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: Counsel has exceeded the</p> <p>19 10-hour limit, number 1. Number 2, with --</p> <p>20 astonishingly, with about 60 or 30 seconds</p> <p>21 left, he produced one of, apparently, multiple</p> <p>22 reports that are revealed in Dr. Conti's CV,</p> <p>23 and has asked her to determine what parts of</p> <p>24 it, if any, are replicated or appear in the</p> <p>25 current report. She's not had an opportunity</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 202</p> <p>1 to look at the document, and now defendants 2 exist -- insist, having exceeded the 10-hour 3 limit, to mark an exhibit that the witness has 4 not seen or been given an opportunity to 5 review. Therefore, I object to its being 6 marked.</p> <p>7 It's sort of like piling on at the end 8 and clipping news articles and asking them to 9 be attached as exhibits. It's entirely 10 improper. You haven't asked the witness a 11 single question, nor has she had an opportunity 12 to look at it, and I object.</p> <p>13 MR. OSTFELD: I will state, for the 14 record, that the question I asked the witness 15 was, "Did you copy or adapt portions of your 16 expert report from Blue Cross Blue Shield 17 Association versus GlaxoSmithKline for your 18 declaration in this case?"</p> <p>19 The witness then indicated that she 20 wished to go, paragraph by paragraph, through 21 her report and to compare it to the reports 22 from Blue Cross Blue Shield Association.</p> <p>23 MR. HONIK: She did no such thing.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: -- mischaracterizing my 25 statement --</p>	<p>1 of the document. She merely asked to look at 2 the document. And for minutes that took you 3 past, as a matter of fact, the 10-hour limit, 4 it's not my position that you went past the 5 10-hour time limit. You went past the 10-hour 6 time limit.</p> <p>7 And you then finally offered her one 8 of the multiple reports that she prepared. And 9 she tried to answer your question, and it 10 ended. That's an improper use of an exhibit. 11 It is beyond the pale to have done so with 30 12 or 60 seconds. It's the worst form of lawyerly 13 got you imaginable, and I object. And we'll 14 move to strike at the appropriate time.</p> <p>15 I can't prevent you saying it's 16 being -- it's being marked, but we will move to 17 strike it. And it is really unseemly that you 18 have chosen to do that.</p> <p>19 That concludes the deposition.</p> <p>20 MR. OSTFELD: This report is being 21 marked, and I will provide --</p> <p>22 THE COURT REPORTER: I can only do 23 this one at a time. Greg -- Greg, this report 24 is being marked...</p> <p>25 MR. OSTFELD: Hang on. Madam Court</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 203</p> <p>1 MR. OSTFELD: Excuse me. Excuse me. 2 Please -- please allow me to finish my 3 statement for record, Ruben. I didn't 4 interrupt you.</p> <p>5 And, Dr. Conti, I didn't interrupt 6 you. And these are being -- these are -- these 7 are records that are being made for the court.</p> <p>8 So I then put into the record the one 9 report that I have in my possession from that 10 case so that Dr. Conti could reference it to 11 complete her analysis. There was a question 12 pending. We were trying to answer it in the 13 manner in which she wanted to answer it, which 14 was going through her report. And Mr. Honik 15 has now taken the view that time has expired.</p> <p>16 I would object to terminating the 17 deposition when there was a pending question 18 and where counsel was attempting to provide 19 Dr. Conti with the mechanism she asked for to 20 answer the question.</p> <p>21 MR. HONIK: Yeah. Mr. Ostfeld, that 22 is about as big a distortion as one could -- 23 could possibly state. The witness did not ask 24 to go line by line. You asked her a question 25 without the -- excuse me -- without the benefit</p>	<p>1 Reporter, can you please hang on? I'll let 2 you -- don't talk over me so that you can't 3 hear what I'm saying.</p> <p>4 Ruben, we know you are concluding the 5 deposition, but you can't do it the way you are 6 doing it. Okay? We still have to finish the 7 deposition the right way. You can't just stop 8 it. Okay. Yes, we can't just go off the 9 record in a ladder.</p> <p>10 MR. HONIK: Yes, we're --</p> <p>11 MR. GOLDBERG: Now, I'm gonna say 12 something, Ruben.</p> <p>13 Dr. Conti, during the deposition, you 14 were texted by counsel. I'm going to ask you 15 that you not delete that text. Do not delete 16 any text that you received from counsel during 17 this deposition.</p> <p>18 MR. HONIK: You're mischaracterizing 19 the record.</p> <p>20 MR. GOLDBERG: Ruben --</p> <p>21 MR. HONIK: No. No. No. No.</p> <p>22 MR. GOLDBERG: We will address this 23 issue later, but it is important that this 24 record be preserved. And I don't want 25 Dr. Conti to leave until we have made that</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

	Page 206		Page 208
1	record.	1	am attaching as an exhibit and putting in.
2	MR. HONIK: You can make whatever	2	And I will provide it to the court
3	record you want.	3	reporter as an exhibit. And we certainly do
4	MR. GOLDBERG: Now --	4	not waive anything that is not in the public
5	THE COURT REPORTER: I can't do this.	5	court file in that case.
6	I can't. I can't do it. One at a time. One	6	(Whereupon, Exhibit Conti 8 was marked
7	at a time.	7	for Identification.)
8	MR. GOLDBERG: Okay. Now that we have	8	MR. HONIK: Anything else?
9	done that -- okay. Let the record reflect that	9	MR. OSTFELD: That's it for me.
10	the witness has just walked away during the	10	MR. HONIK: We're concluded. Thank
11	deposition.	11	you, Jamie.
12	MR. HONIK: Are you 12 years old,	12	(Whereupon, the deposition concluded
13	Seth?	13	at 5:08 p.m.)
14	MR. GOLDBERG: No.	14	
15	MR. HONIK: As far as the witness is	15	
16	concerned, it's over. There are no more	16	
17	questions that you may be permitted to ask	17	
18	Dr. Conti. She can get up and stretch her	18	
19	legs, do whatever she wishes in the world,	19	
20	number 1.	20	
21	Number 2, Mr. Ostfeld apparently has	21	
22	now attached as an exhibit a report that makes	22	
23	reference to an Austin and Burke PowerPoint	23	
24	that Teva clawed back. So Teva has now waived	24	
25	their privilege as to that document being	25	
	Page 207		Page 209
1	admitted into evidence into this case. Is	1	C E R T I F I C A T E
2	there anything else you need to say?	2	
3	MR. GOLDBERG: Yeah, I do. And then	3	I, Jamie I. Moskowitz, a Shorthand
4	certainly Mr. Ostfeld can.	4	(Stenotype) Reporter and Notary Public, do hereby
5	We are keeping this deposition open,	5	certify that the foregoing Deposition, of the
6	because the witness has now testified during	6	witness, RENA M. CONTI, Ph.D., taken at the time and
7	the deposition, potentially, to documents that	7	place aforesaid, is a true and correct transcription
8	she has not produced, including her invoices.	8	of my shorthand notes.
9	It's not clear whether there were other	9	I further certify that I am neither
10	documents that she hasn't produced. We'll come	10	counsel for nor related to any party to said action,
11	back to you on that, Ruben. But we are not	11	nor in any way interested in the result or outcome
12	closing this deposition until we get a complete	12	thereof.
13	record from Dr. Conti of the work she has done	13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
14	in response to the deposition notice.	14	my hand this 17 day of February 2022.
15	Now, I'll turn it -- turn it to	15	
16	Mr. Ostfeld to address your last point.	16	
17	MR. OSTFELD: I am putting into the	17	<i>Jamie Illyse Moskowitz</i> Jamie Illyse Moskowitz License No. XI01658
18	record as an exhibit a document titled, "Expert	18	
19	Report of Rena Conti, Ph.D" from the case	19	
20	Blue Cross Blue Shield Association versus	20	
21	GlaxoSmithKline.	21	
22	This is taken from the public court	22	
23	file in that case. It has the court stamp at	23	
24	the top of it. It is document 286-2 from that	24	
25	court file. That is the only document that I	25	

CONFIDENTIAL

1 RUBEN HONIK, ESQUIRE 2 ruben@honiklaw.com 3 February 17, 2022. 4 RE: In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, Et Al v. 5 2/11/2022, Rena Conti, PH.D (#5073516) 6 The above-referenced transcript is available for 7 review. 8 Within the applicable timeframe, the witness should 9 read the testimony to verify its accuracy. If there are 10 any changes, the witness should note those with the 11 reason, on the attached Errata Sheet. 12 The witness should sign the Acknowledgment of 13 DepONENT and Errata and return to the deposing attorney. 14 Copies should be sent to all counsel, and to Veritext at 15 erratas-cs@veritext.com 16 17 Return completed errata within 30 days from 18 receipt of testimony. 19 If the witness fails to do so within the time 20 allotted, the transcript may be used as if signed. 21 22 Yours, 23 Veritext Legal Solutions 24 25	Page 210	1 In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, Et Al v. 2 Rena Conti, PH.D (#5073516) 3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT 4 I, Rena Conti, PH.D, do hereby declare that I 5 have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any 6 corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as 7 noted above to be appended hereto, and that the same is 8 a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony 9 given by me. 10 11 _____ 12 Rena Conti, PH.D Date 13 *If notary is required 14 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS 15 _____ DAY OF _____, 20____. 16 17 18 _____ 19 NOTARY PUBLIC 20 21 22 23 24 25	Page 212
1 In Re: Valsartan, Losartan, Et Al v. 2 Rena Conti, PH.D (#5073516) 3 E R R A T A S H E E T 4 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 5 _____ 6 REASON_____ 7 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 8 _____ 9 REASON_____ 10 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 11 _____ 12 REASON_____ 13 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 14 _____ 15 REASON_____ 16 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 17 _____ 18 REASON_____ 19 PAGE____ LINE____ CHANGE_____ 20 _____ 21 REASON_____ 22 _____ 23 _____ 24 Rena Conti, PH.D Date 25	Page 211		

CONFIDENTIAL

[& - 4:40]

Page 1

&	146:17 148:2	2/11/2022 210:5	74:9 80:23 83:23
& 2:16,20 3:17 4:18 5:2,7,11 6:2 6:13,18 7:8	1100 2:4 1154 209:16 11:03 76:2 11:41 100:3 11:46 100:8 11:49 100:9 12 199:1 206:12 13 199:1 14 199:2 1400 7:9	20 92:15 106:17 212:15 20004 3:13 5:14 20006 4:20 2012 27:21 114:14 143:10 2018 25:13,15 27:23 48:9 114:14 156:22 157:5,18 198:14	100:10 109:1 112:22 113:8,14 115:2 154:13 169:14,16 171:19 174:1 186:13 3,741 19:11 30 3:6 13:11 201:20 204:11 210:17 300 4:20 31 159:23 3100 4:5 312 7:9 312.456.1065 4:6 312.566.4803 7:6 314.480.1500 4:16 317.236.1313 5:9 32 169:13 32nd 3:19 33 146:17 3600 4:11 38th 6:4
0	15 82:25 183:22 199:3 1515 2:4 15219 3:20 6:4 15th 6:10 16 199:18 17 200:2 209:14 210:3 1700 4:20 17th 3:6 18 8:3 200:3 182 10:6 19 200:3 190 4:15 19102 2:4 19103 3:7 1st 27:21 48:8	2019 27:23 48:9 202.452.7900 4:21 202.624.2500 5:15 202.776.7800 3:14 2020 143:8 2022 1:12 209:14 210:3 208 8:5 21 5:20 212.355.9500 2:18 212.415.9357 6:20 214.855.8221 4:12 215.979.1000 3:7 2200 4:11 2220 7:5 227 5:4 23 156:8 230 7:5 250 2:17 267.435.1300 2:5 27th 6:15 28202 5:4 286-2 207:24 2875 1:2 2:45 195:7	4 15:6 94:24 95:1 95:2,8,12 111:17 111:18 154:5,16 154:18 198:24 412.263.4397 6:5 412.560.3300 3:20 45202-4029 7:10 46204 5:9 47 118:18 4:03 154:17 4:04 155:16 4:05 155:20 4:34 183:6 4:40 183:9
1	2 2 20:18 21:7,11,11 50:22 54:25 55:21 56:12,19 58:19 59:4,12,14 65:25 66:1,2,4,8,18 68:25 74:6,16,19 78:6 80:23 83:23 84:22 100:4 109:1 115:2 201:19 206:21 2,532,769 56:25	3 20:19 21:9,12 28:11,23 55:21 56:12 58:19 59:10 59:14 63:1 66:1	

[5 - added]

Page 2

5	62 48:23 73:8 74:11 63 27:24 28:10,19 48:1 84:14 173:20 173:21 63105 4:16 64 48:1 61:7 171:11,14 172:5,8 173:21 67 156:25	84 61:20 9 92 118:2 973 6:11 973.228.9898 2:9 9:04 1:13 11:1 9th 3:13	accounted 149:15 150:15 accounting 121:1 150:14 177:16 accounts 150:10 accrues 150:9 accuracy 210:9 accurate 45:7,8 accurately 43:23 193:1 acknowledgement 212:3 acknowledgment 210:12 acquire 123:6 174:9 181:13 182:1 acquired 26:19 130:5 acquiring 129:25 act 46:19 actavis 183:14 action 209:10 actions 1:5 active 172:11 activities 103:22 actual 17:6,7 30:22 31:19 62:2 63:3 64:18,19 65:17 91:3,21 96:3 118:24 131:20 133:20 162:8 166:18 ad 199:6,11,14 adam 2:7 adapt 197:16 202:15 adapted 196:9,14 add 70:21 added 174:6 199:4
6	7 7 8:3 18:6,10 20:2 29:3 31:25 34:18 44:3 47:23 49:3 51:10 52:6,9 701 2:24 70130 2:24 704.444.3475 5:5 72 74:18 73 74:18 75 138:7,14 139:24 148:7 75201-7932 4:11 757.1100 6:11 76 110:15,20 77 4:5 776 69:23 78 32:4,7,9 49:8 171:6,10,12 78746 2:13 79 55:16,20 73:23	absolute 192:11 absolutely 75:2 118:12 189:16 academic 89:24 90:15 107:3 academy 199:14 access 40:11 42:22 107:12 accommodate 51:14 125:4 139:25 165:24	
	8 8 8:5 10:7 15:6 127:25 128:2,17 208:6 80 122:8,15 130:22 130:23 132:24 81 127:1 82 136:19	account 64:11 91:20 124:16 126:10 147:17 149:15 158:14 170:23 171:23 184:2 185:2,11	

CONFIDENTIAL

[adding - answered]

Page 3

adding 35:23	133:14 137:19,21	allocations 68:20	anal 147:21
addition 31:4	138:19 143:2	68:21,22	analyses 57:23
35:19 91:21	145:17,20 147:12	allotted 210:20	analysis 25:8 31:5
additional 37:9	167:6 168:6	allow 125:14	31:24 34:12,16
54:5 64:7,14	169:14	203:2	40:17 67:21 72:6
84:19 91:2 138:10	aggregated 26:7	allowed 25:22	103:3 156:21
155:9 185:10	35:20 44:16 64:2	135:25	157:9,16 158:9,24
187:3	147:6	alluded 39:18	163:19,21 164:2
additions 212:6	aggregation 35:22	alternatively	165:20 166:2,7,21
address 30:18	42:24 134:24	197:24	172:3 173:10
39:20 164:2 166:8	agnostic 184:17	america 40:21	186:10 188:2
205:22 207:16	ago 160:5	74:25	190:18,21 191:9
addressed 52:20	agree 60:7 144:21	america's 199:16	203:11
adjusted 185:9	144:23 152:7	americsource	analyst 51:23 54:3
adjustments 184:2	172:9 173:3 191:2	101:18	analysts 53:18
185:2,10	191:17	amerisourceberg...	analyzing 191:11
administration	agreed 167:24	7:11 101:16,19	andras 4:3
189:5	189:25 191:2,17	102:2,15,19	andrast 4:3
administrative	agreement 106:5	103:16 110:16	annual 132:7
166:9	180:8	111:7,11 112:1	144:2
admitted 207:1	agreements 106:3	113:11 132:6	answer 9:3 38:13
adulterated 27:23	ahead 15:19	143:10,25 144:10	39:2,3,12 45:3
48:9 186:1,9	166:22	151:10	46:20 58:17 60:2
188:14 189:7	aid 5:10 11:16	amount 15:22	60:17 66:13,20,23
190:2,6 191:3,18	41:19	23:12 35:13,21	69:6 71:4,5 75:12
193:5,23 194:9	al 198:15 210:4	39:23,24 57:4	76:12,18 79:12
adulteration	211:1 212:1	60:10,25 61:1	80:2 83:19 85:16
186:20 192:6,7,20	albertsons 4:21	63:9,10,19 65:4,14	86:1,13 88:12
advance 143:3	5:5 42:4,10,11,15	79:13 81:13 82:10	95:6 112:14 115:7
advisor 199:7,7,11	alek 3:5	82:23 83:1 89:4	120:3,14 125:14
199:14	alfano 6:2	127:8 128:4	126:16 128:22
ae 34:10	allegations 99:13	130:16 131:17,17	131:25 139:13,16
aforesaid 209:7	192:17	144:24 145:13	140:13 159:9
afternoon 154:21	alleged 27:11,13	176:10 178:9	161:9,18 174:17
154:22 155:23	157:6	181:4,7,13 182:1	178:14 179:1,20
182:21 183:12	allegedly 163:17	amounts 23:19	180:13,23 182:10
agents 167:9	166:11	49:16,18,21 50:13	184:7 197:4,25
aggregate 26:22	alleging 83:15	63:16,21 65:17,18	203:12,13,20
30:10,19 55:17	allocation 60:4	65:20 67:2 98:15	204:9
66:4,5 73:24,25	67:16,18,20 68:1,9	105:8 136:14	answered 26:18
74:4,7,9 118:22	69:4 70:23 71:1	147:12	53:14 69:12 72:25

CONFIDENTIAL

[answered - attorneys]

Page 4

73:10 79:11 97:7 98:23 153:8 159:7 174:16 176:1 178:12 179:18 181:16 182:3,7,9 182:11 184:5,20 187:19 193:25 answering 175:2,7 196:21 answers 180:25 anticipate 151:19 anybody 178:22 apart 166:14 api 106:19 apologies 35:11 apologize 45:11 154:6 apparently 201:21 206:21 appear 201:24 appended 212:7 appendix 13:13 apples 59:8 applicable 210:8 applied 61:5 126:2 186:2,16,19 187:6 apply 47:10 149:11 190:13,21 applying 190:3 apportioned 109:3 apportionment 60:4 appreciate 51:1 68:5 163:13 appropriate 36:1 36:10 128:3 147:23 204:14 area 112:24 arizona 56:16,24 58:6,8,13,25	arrangement 98:2 arrangements 96:13,17 arrive 63:23 art 22:5 94:4 119:25 article 118:1,10 179:5 articles 202:8 aside 64:17 65:1 asked 27:16 39:5 47:2,11 53:13 72:5,24 76:23 79:10 83:21 97:6 98:22 113:9 114:10 115:20 122:16 130:15 140:5 152:4 153:7 168:4 174:16 175:25 176:6 178:12 179:17,25 181:15 182:2 184:4,19 186:8 187:19 188:3 192:2 193:24 196:25 201:23 202:10,14 203:19 203:24 204:1 asking 11:17 13:16,17,19 18:20 19:3 35:4 38:10 41:1 42:10 66:14 72:7 77:23 81:4,6 86:3 87:1 92:4 93:24 94:3,9 120:2 137:6,7 139:7,8 141:19 142:14 163:3 165:1 173:24 175:3 180:3 182:5 187:14 188:15	189:13 192:25 195:15,17,19 196:12,15,23,24 197:20 202:8 aslater 2:8 aspect 90:14 aspects 89:21 asserted 189:3 assess 47:25 132:12 assessed 96:23 assessing 70:25 assessment 71:7 assessments 25:11 assigned 161:13 assignment 71:3 71:12 159:12 assistance 195:23 associated 26:3 65:22 92:24 99:5 association 8:6 197:9,12,18 198:15 202:17,22 207:20 assume 27:16 32:14 36:10 39:8 68:12 69:19 70:8 83:21 113:9 114:10,24 115:20 186:9 188:6,11 assumed 79:3 157:15 assuming 32:16 43:16 98:8 143:13 144:9 198:24 assumption 33:25 38:19,21 143:16 157:9 188:1,1,4,15 189:2,8,12 192:19 193:4,22	assumptions 45:18 51:14 53:20 69:9 79:4 113:5 186:2 186:20 188:9 189:18,19,24 190:3 191:1,16 astonishingly 201:20 asymmetric 114:15 157:23 158:11 163:20 191:20 192:3 attached 181:6 202:9 206:22 210:11 attaching 208:1 attachment 15:5,7 41:25 44:19 45:22 46:16 47:3,24 53:4 56:14,21 58:4 62:3,4 63:4 64:19,20 109:9,12 109:17 111:14,16 111:18 attachments 44:7 44:19 47:19,21 51:8,12 52:16 74:3 attempt 71:17 attempted 116:10 attempting 203:18 attention 156:6 attestations 189:10 attested 189:4 attorney 38:11 112:11 125:11 183:18 210:13 attorneys 29:24 186:14
--	--	---	--

attributable 160:1 166:10	60:18 64:21 65:24 73:1 75:17 76:3	bates 17:24 18:3 bazan 3:11 befuddle 180:25	198:14,14 199:22 199:22 202:16,16 202:22,22 207:20 207:20	
attribution 34:13	95:1 100:7,10	beginning 28:12 28:12 73:20 127:1	bockius 3:17	
august 25:15 156:22 157:5,18 158:22 198:14	106:8 110:21 112:21,24 113:4 127:24 129:2	142:3	bold 2:13	
aurobindo 3:21 69:21	130:22 154:18 155:21 162:1	begins 11:2 54:25 100:10 154:18	bosick 6:2	
austin 2:13 206:23	175:9 183:10	believe 97:15	boston 6:15	
available 154:5 158:12 161:22 166:25 172:14 179:5 210:6	206:24 207:11	111:14 156:19 173:4 180:1 181:3	bottles 147:5	
avenue 4:11 5:14	background 27:3 105:19 132:19 155:13 200:5	benefit 168:2	bottom 69:24 146:17	
average 84:22,24 85:12,20 86:7,20 87:12 88:2,2,4,9 89:12 94:16 95:21	backs 145:15 148:5,11 166:8,9	169:6 179:14,15 179:23 180:11	boxes 147:8	
averages 119:5,5	backup 18:20,22 19:3,7,25 20:15 21:5 118:6 168:4	203:25	brand 185:25 186:9 187:10,16	
award 65:12	bad 22:7,8 54:10	benefits 93:11	branded 99:4	
aware 13:22 33:19 33:20,23 40:23 42:25 43:10 92:22 123:19,23 124:1 135:11 148:20 181:11,21	bag 91:11,17 93:7	bennett 24:21 25:17 31:21	break 54:16,23 55:3 75:22 76:1,5 76:24,25,25 78:4 99:23 100:6 150:2 154:15 183:4,8	
awash 135:10	barcode 136:2,7	berne 7:8	breaking 77:9,16	
awsmolij 3:5	bargaining 151:12	bernstein 2:16	breaks 76:6,16 108:24	
b				
b 3:6 5:3 7:3 8:1 13:11,13 15:5,19 18:17,23 19:6 29:12 41:25 109:9 109:12,17 111:14 111:16,18 123:14 132:14	barnes 5:7 base 106:19 129:9 131:9	best 101:6 132:20 176:4	bresnahan 5:12	
back 11:2 27:6 28:11 29:2 34:17 35:25 36:2 47:25 49:6 51:16 53:21 54:11,25 58:20	based 29:21 51:9 53:19 63:25 65:3 86:16 126:5 131:20 134:18 184:22	beyond 70:19 86:23 139:15 145:4 186:21 187:19 204:11	brick 32:14	
	bases 68:16 basic 84:17 129:10 141:20	big 150:7 203:22 bill 78:23 166:8	brief 168:8	
	basically 49:1 124:6 147:10	bills 25:3,12,13 bily 7:13	briefly 155:2	
	basis 31:4 44:5 60:19 70:17 192:19 193:4,21	bipc.com 4:19 5:3 bit 19:14 108:13 111:13 120:25 123:12 151:17	broader 17:13	
	batch 118:24 133:19	bizarre 92:22 blackwell 4:14 168:20,23	btlaw.com 5:8	
		blank 33:10 blue 8:5,6 197:9,9 197:12,12,18,18	buchanan 4:18 5:2	
			build 53:18 bully 183:18	
			bundle 152:10	
			burke 206:23	
			business 102:4 132:10 146:6	
			busy 108:16	
			c	
			c 2:1,23 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 31:25 61:7 209:1,1	

CONFIDENTIAL

[c.whiteley - charge]

Page 6

c.whiteley 2:21	185:8	care 121:25	caveat 47:8,11
cabraser 2:16	call 17:9 119:11	carlo 5:19	cdehart 5:20
calculate 47:16	120:13 133:24	carolina 5:4	center 6:10 201:5
49:12 54:12 72:5	called 47:23	carondelet 4:15	centre 3:19 6:4
116:11 125:25	109:19 111:19	carve 146:13	cents 98:17
133:3,10 135:8	170:23	case 12:7,24 13:7	cert 168:8
140:5 161:7	calls 45:10 58:16	14:20 29:10,14	certain 96:18,18
175:22 177:10,20	67:15 83:18 85:25	31:3 37:12 41:12	96:19 105:22,24
178:8 181:3	86:11 122:25	42:9 60:22 71:13	115:20 145:18
calculated 58:24	124:4 126:14	74:22 99:13,14	certainly 103:13
59:1 66:8 73:2	139:3 145:7 184:5	100:20 105:1	106:25 196:19
125:23 167:19,22	camp 2:24	107:5 109:19,22	199:3 207:4 208:3
173:25 177:1	campbell 5:13	109:24 110:3	certified 1:14,15
183:25 185:16	10:5 100:12,14,18	111:3 112:2	certify 209:5,9
calculating 61:21	100:25 101:4,7,21	114:22 115:5,23	cetera 137:24
86:7,16 90:3	104:21 106:1	118:9,14 121:18	151:18 190:10
115:24 116:5	107:15 109:6,10	135:22,22 149:1	192:7
122:17 124:15	110:22 112:20,23	151:24 152:17	cgannon 6:8
138:7 139:9	113:1 114:5,21	167:17 169:9	cgmp 190:7
156:14	115:15 116:8,14	171:1 176:13	199:20 200:8
calculation 17:13	116:16 119:14	185:15 186:11	chain 37:7 103:6
20:13,24 21:13	121:7 122:7,9	188:2 193:6	106:21 114:18,20
24:24 51:22,24	123:15 124:13	195:11,16,20,21	117:9,17 120:1,10
53:24 56:23 59:6	125:6,19 126:22	196:1,2,9,10,11,13	120:17 121:15
62:2 65:10 66:16	127:23 128:15	196:14,16,17	135:2 136:5
66:17 87:16	129:1,14 130:8,19	197:11,15,17,20	142:13 145:21
106:14 125:16	130:21,24 132:22	197:22 198:3,17	164:8,19 172:17
126:6 127:18	135:19 138:13	199:21,23,25	change 51:5 54:4,5
129:2,9 130:7,9	139:6 140:3,16,21	200:8,9 201:5	152:24 198:24
140:8,24 160:4,13	140:22 141:3,22	202:18 203:10	199:17 211:4,7,10
165:22,23 167:18	142:1,4 144:20	207:1,19,23 208:5	211:13,16,19
169:17 171:8,16	146:1	cases 31:9 116:9	changed 53:3
187:6	capital 94:21 99:7	199:24	191:1 199:3,4
calculations 17:6	captured 64:13	cash 77:10,18	200:2,3
17:8 21:6 44:5	card 78:19,24	78:11,14,20,21,21	changes 210:10
53:19 54:6 58:5,7	cardinal 5:15	79:2,6,9 80:17,17	212:6
63:3 66:10 98:19	101:15,23 102:2	81:10,15,17,20,20	changing 75:19
116:4 124:8	102:15,20 103:16	81:24,24 166:9	characterization
138:23 149:13	111:6,11 112:1	categories 48:17	60:13
162:24 163:13	113:12 132:6	category 142:16	charge 16:5 82:23
184:12,13,16	143:11,17,25		91:13 145:15

[charge - concluded]

Page 7

148:5,11 166:8 charged 23:21 97:11 charlotte 5:4 charts 181:6 cheap 146:10 check 13:13,14 20:10,24 21:3 29:7 31:11 33:13 43:25 79:4 108:15 157:2 checking 20:11 checks 31:15 cherry 201:6 chewing 71:16 chicago 4:5 7:5 15:24 16:4,12 104:6 chosen 204:18 christine 6:8 christopher 5:3 christopher.henry 5:3 cincinnati 7:10 circumstances 181:12,23 cite 175:14,21 cited 12:17 claim 39:23 49:22 64:2,25 123:22 claiming 65:14 claims 15:8,14,18 17:10,11,24 20:13 21:20 22:1,3,12 23:5 26:15 29:19 29:21 30:22 31:20 32:18 33:9,17 36:12,19,21 37:17 39:8 40:24 41:2 41:15 42:7 43:5 46:19 48:21 49:15	49:15 50:8,9,15,17 50:22 57:6 59:12 65:3,19 67:1,3 71:11 74:11 171:17 clarification 169:11 170:21 clarify 86:4 128:1 180:5 clarifying 36:7 class 12:24 13:2 77:8,15 85:22 86:10,23 101:10 101:11 121:12 122:2,5 123:4 136:1,4 168:8 classes 164:4 clawed 206:24 clean 31:10 clear 54:2 74:19 160:23 176:5 178:12 207:9 clearer 95:23 clearly 45:23 57:21 94:1 95:24 clerk 91:11 client 38:11 client's 185:15 clients 193:23 clinics 117:15 121:24 clipping 202:8 close 101:5 closed 102:10 closely 151:25 closing 207:12 coan 6:14 code 22:17 25:7,20 26:21 29:14 35:5 40:14 59:7 119:6 133:19 186:24	codes 24:10 29:21 29:25 30:5 50:10 51:21 54:5 57:13 118:22 186:15 187:2,3 coleen 3:4 collaboration 104:17 collaborative 16:5 16:6 collect 37:2 40:20 collected 17:14 96:10 collecting 16:23 collectively 113:12 color 180:21 column 29:9,12 31:25 34:20 35:8 35:8,12 68:11 70:12,13 72:23 columns 19:16 29:6 come 127:6 162:3 172:20 207:10 comes 123:19 comfortable 34:14 53:16 189:18 coming 110:2 188:16 commencing 1:13 commentary 180:21 comments 164:9 180:15 commercial 23:24 96:25 committed 83:16 committee 199:8 199:15 commonly 99:11	communicated 188:24 communication 38:19 76:10 communications 76:6,22 77:1 194:3 companies 12:24 42:21,23 131:6,10 132:5,9 153:15 company 151:8 153:10 compare 197:25 200:13,20 202:21 compared 64:19 comparing 59:8 complaint 27:17 28:13,24 83:22 115:2 186:14 192:17 193:6,20 complete 53:22 200:11 203:11 207:12 212:8 completed 210:17 completely 71:11 164:21 completion 31:11 compliant 190:7 components 105:3 compound 39:6 166:13 195:13 computer 106:9 132:3 155:14 concept 42:25 146:23 152:19 concern 86:15 concerned 206:16 concerns 67:21 concluded 199:25 208:10,12
--	---	---	--

CONFIDENTIAL

[concludes - copy]

Page 8

concludes 204:19	consideration 92:5	106:24 119:25	116:17 122:11
concluding 11:8	considerations	121:20 133:1	154:4,21 155:23
205:4	146:13	157:10 158:1	159:4 162:20
conclusion 45:10	considered 70:1,2	160:20 162:9,18	168:4 169:15
45:17 58:16 60:1	138:21 139:22	165:16 166:16	183:12,19 200:23
67:15 69:2 83:18	148:8 167:3 173:6	171:16 172:19	203:5,10,19
85:25 86:12	174:11,11	176:13,16 177:4	205:13,25 206:18
119:11 120:13	considering 37:4	189:6 191:25	207:13,19 208:6
126:14 139:3	consistent 156:24	192:3	209:6 210:5 211:2
145:8 184:6	consultant 199:5	contain 30:12 42:7	211:24 212:2,4,12
concomitantly	consume 168:13	53:22 136:8 157:6	cont'd 201:22
168:7	consumed 159:16	contained 33:5,6	continue 146:21
concrete 82:25	consumer 19:18	52:5 147:12	continues 148:3
condition 192:2	23:22 35:10,12	157:18 173:25	contours 189:15
conduct 114:25	39:19 40:2,16	193:6	contract 143:14
115:5	41:4 43:7 46:18	contaminated	144:9,11,12
conducted 166:2	49:16,21 50:12	157:11,12 159:17	150:22 151:9
confer 13:23	56:15,24 58:12	163:25 165:25	152:6 153:1
154:11	59:17 60:23 61:2	166:11	contracted 143:2
conferences 102:9	63:15 67:10 68:10	contamination	contracting 143:7
103:17	70:13 71:20 72:9	114:16 157:25	143:9
confidential 1:8	72:11,22 77:8,15	158:16 188:23	contracts 143:1,4
70:2 76:9 166:25	85:11 89:11 92:7	194:4,5	143:17 145:2,5,11
confidentiality	93:9,9 94:15,17,18	content 144:17	145:23 146:3,5
106:2,5 125:12	117:14 119:8	contents 10:1	151:22 152:9,16
confine 25:22	120:11 159:13	33:15	152:20,21,21,24
confined 156:21	160:1 161:25	context 101:22	153:2,24
confirm 13:6 35:4	163:5,12,21 164:4	102:1 105:11	contrast 200:21
37:16 38:20 46:4	176:10 192:9	117:8 129:17	contribute 88:14
111:24 119:7,20	consumers 22:15	140:6,15,17,23	controversial
confirmed 68:18	30:10 48:4 50:6	contexts 101:16	57:17 77:5 171:5
confirms 38:24	63:22 65:13 67:2	conti 1:11 2:5 8:3	convenient 201:7
confused 185:6	67:9,10 69:22	8:5,5 10:2 11:15	conversation
conjunction 163:1	70:12,15 71:21	15:5 18:6,10 20:2	148:12
conlee 2:21	77:20 84:23 85:3	27:7 29:3 44:3	conversations
consented 177:5	85:13,21 86:8,9,9	47:23 49:3 51:10	135:7,21
consequently	86:16,21 87:13	55:3 68:19 70:24	copied 196:9,13
128:3 133:2	88:3,5,10,24 89:9	76:5 87:22 100:13	copies 210:14
consider 43:4	89:13 90:10,17	100:22 101:8	copy 197:16
137:2,15 148:5	94:12 95:3,14,18	109:8,11 110:23	202:15
165:20	95:20,22 97:11,20	111:18 113:2	

CONFIDENTIAL

[corporation - court]

Page 9

corporation 4:12 110:16	82:8 85:12,21 86:7,18,20 87:13	6:16,21 7:6,11 11:8,10 13:24	107:13 110:4 146:6 192:14
corporations 144:2	88:2,3 89:12,14 90:10,16,19,24,25	36:9,16,18 37:8,15 38:9,22 39:7 45:1	coursework 101:10,11
correct 12:14 13:8 13:9,16 15:11 24:14 25:4,13,14 29:8,10,15 32:1,3 32:15 35:16,17,19 35:23 42:6 44:4 44:14,17 45:1,4,7 45:19 47:10,24 49:3 56:4,12 57:7 57:8 58:7,14 60:10,15 62:22 63:2,9 65:5 66:11 67:11 68:20 79:20 84:6 85:9,10 108:2 111:22,23 112:2,3 114:9 115:5,8,8 116:2 119:9,22 120:1,4,5 121:9 127:3 128:14,19 132:1,2 132:3 146:23 149:9 152:24 156:17,18,22,23 157:2 158:24,25 160:8 169:20 170:19 184:18 186:3,11 190:10 191:22 192:20 193:7 198:20,21 209:7 212:8	91:9,10,11,14,21 92:6 93:2,6,7,7,10 93:14,19,20,22,25 94:7,11,14,17,18 94:20,23 95:1,2,12 95:13,13,14,16,18 95:21 98:20,25 99:2 126:25 127:10,19 129:24 133:20 134:8,9 138:1 145:2 146:16 147:24 148:2,2,4,9 149:4 149:12,25 150:2 150:12 173:11,15 174:9,12 175:23 175:24 176:8,19 177:2,11,17	45:18,24 46:3,13 46:19,24 47:7,16 50:11 76:10,14 104:2 112:8 113:9 115:14 122:17 124:24 125:3 126:15,20 132:18 138:23 140:2 149:2,16 154:10 161:4 163:10 166:5 168:7,17 184:23 185:1 186:15,24 187:1 188:3 193:11,14 193:16 201:18 203:18 205:14,16 209:10 210:14	court 1:1,14 11:12 14:5,7 16:1,9 17:18 23:6 24:16 34:1 45:2 57:11 59:20 61:23 64:4 66:21 67:17,19 69:4,12 71:8 75:8 77:11,15 80:13 81:22 91:5,8 96:14 97:22 100:16,25 101:2 101:17,20 104:15 105:7,13 107:10 110:18 112:17 113:20 114:19 115:10 120:19 121:4 125:1,3 126:20 128:12,23 129:12,15 130:1
costco 132:8 144:3	costs 61:12,13,16 64:7,14 84:18,22 88:22,23 89:8,8,25 90:4,5 91:2,18,21 92:1,15,17 93:2,2 93:23 94:10 95:9 95:9,10,10,17 99:5 99:7 130:6 135:12 138:10 149:18,19 149:20 150:2,4,5,5 150:9,10,11,17	127:17 158:14 43:23 59:4 149:23 150:20	count 131:24 132:15 counted 135:13 138:9,11 138:23 140:1,19 141:25 149:3,6,17
corrections 212:6	counter 63:22	63:22 79:14 91:12,17 94:22 166:19 167:13	149:22 150:18 153:16,19,21 158:4 162:13,16 164:13 165:6
correctly 94:5	counterfeit 135:5	166:5 167:20	
correspondence 13:24 103:20	counting 97:9	169:2,4 170:8	
corresponds 44:8	couple 158:11	171:13 178:1,21	
cost 48:6 50:4 64:11 65:20,20	173:23 174:20 176:20 177:4,6,7	182:22,25 185:1 185:12,18,21	
	costumer 143:20	193:13,18 194:18	
	counsel 2:5,10,14	194:23 199:10	
	2:19,25 3:8,14,21	203:7 204:22,25	
	4:6,12,17,21 5:5	206:5 207:22,23	
	5:10,15,22 6:5,12	207:25 208:2,5	

[cover - davis]

Page 10

cover 143:4 195:4	143:19 144:5	71:20 72:10,23	42:6,7,11,15,16,23
covered 74:21	145:22	73:12,24 74:1,4,7	43:1,5,7,11,12,16
covers 97:24	cut 38:3,4 155:1,2	74:10,13,16,16	43:17,20,24,25
cpudt 95:21	175:5	84:1,3,5 106:14	44:12 49:15,23
crazy 87:8	cv 16:22 197:14,21	115:25 116:11	51:16 52:1,1,12,13
create 29:19 47:20	198:4,6,7,10 200:1	122:18 124:1,15	52:15,18 53:6,17
51:7,11 52:16	201:22	125:22 126:24	53:20,22 54:10,10
53:6 180:15	cvs 5:10 11:16	127:5,12,18 128:3	54:11 57:6,23
created 24:15	15:23 16:16 41:19	128:10 129:3,10	60:9 65:3,10
creation 21:19,25	42:4,15,15 56:16	130:10 133:4,10	66:15 67:5 81:9
credit 78:19,24	56:24 57:7 58:6	156:14,21 158:23	89:19 96:1,4
criteria 161:11	58:13 63:5,6,15,25	159:12 160:1,12	102:14 104:6,12
162:5	64:8,25,25 65:3	160:14 161:8	104:19,22,24
critical 25:8	75:1 98:5 99:13	162:1 163:5,12,12	105:4 106:3,13
cross 8:6 122:3	170:18 172:15	164:2,3 165:20,21	107:9,11 110:17
197:9,12,18	cwhill 3:4	166:4,7,17 167:19	110:19 111:19,25
198:14 199:22	d	167:22 168:6	112:4,19 122:4
202:16,22 207:20	d 4:14,19 6:18 7:8	169:15,16 181:3,7	124:21,23 125:16
crowell 5:11	34:20 80:22 84:23	183:25 184:3	126:5 132:12
crowell.com 5:12	85:3,13 88:24	185:16	133:3,9,17,20,23
5:13	89:11,12 95:14,19	dan 100:14	133:25 134:2,6
cs 210:15	95:22	dana 3:6	135:10,23 147:21
culbertson 6:13	d'lesli 4:10	daniel 5:13	147:25 148:24
current 194:13	d.stanoch 2:22	data 14:17,17 15:7	160:19 161:2,10
198:25 201:25	daily 26:1 107:13	15:8,14,14,18,22	161:21,23 162:2
currently 13:1	110:5	16:4,5,14,21,24	163:6 166:1,20,24
199:6,13	dallas 4:11	17:9,10,11,24	167:11,11 168:4
curve 187:10,12	damage 37:13	20:15 21:19,20,23	168:10 170:6,10
187:17 190:1,11	57:8 66:7 122:1	21:24,24 22:1,3,3	170:24 173:13
191:10,11,12	124:8 165:23	22:3,10,12,14,19	174:9,10 176:15
customer 23:19	184:12,18 185:7	23:5,12 25:19	177:14,23 186:16
30:18 35:8 41:2,3	damages 8:3 18:7	26:10,15 29:19,21	dataset 50:10
41:4,5,6,7 61:10	18:18 20:4 21:13	30:8,19,22 31:10	53:21
92:14 141:13,16	44:4 48:18 49:9	31:11,15,16,20	datasets 49:15,22
141:21,24 142:3,5	49:10,13,14 55:8	33:9,17 34:15	date 25:9 30:16
142:10,14,15	55:15,17 56:8,9,16	36:10,12,19,21	40:1 69:20 156:15
144:14 145:6	56:24 58:9,12,13	37:2,4,4,9,11,16	211:24 212:12
150:24,25	58:21,24 59:5,18	37:17 38:4 39:8	dates 25:17
customers 141:7,9	66:4,5,6 67:9,10	39:15,17 40:7,11	david 2:22
141:11 142:12,18	67:12 68:8,11,13	40:19,24 41:2,2,3	davis 2:11,12 4:10
142:22,23 143:15	70:12,13,15,25	41:7,10,15,17,22	

[day - different]

Page 11

day 23:15 31:18 93:1 106:16 118:8 135:16,17 172:16 209:14 212:15	days 103:11 210:17	dc 3:13 4:20 5:14	dcampbell 5:13	deal 99:8	dealing 151:9	dean 154:7	decide 127:4 149:7 150:19 185:13	decided 137:17	declaration 13:15 74:3 110:9 114:23 115:4 195:11,12 195:16,20,21,25 196:9,13 197:22 202:18	declarations 13:16 110:25	declare 212:4	deductions 61:24 138:9	deduplicated 55:16,18 58:22 74:4,7,9,16,18	deduplication 55:7,24 56:19 58:20 59:11,13 73:19	deemed 212:6	defendant 3:21 4:6,17,21 5:5,15 6:12,16,21 7:6,11 27:21 36:13 37:19 39:10 41:18,19,22 43:6,8 48:2,7 49:8 49:12,14,22 50:7,8 50:13 58:10 59:19	66:9,10 73:12 74:1,5,8,10,13 99:14 103:12 110:15 113:13 122:18 131:1,5 133:4,5 169:9,18	defendants 3:8,14 5:22 6:5 11:19 12:24 13:25 15:10 18:2 27:15 29:10 29:13 36:11 37:17 38:23 41:12 42:9 44:6 67:12 68:13 74:22 83:16 91:22 110:6 113:11	dehart 5:19	delete 205:15,15	delineated 186:22	delineates 81:9,16	delineation 79:25	deloitte 117:25 118:6,6	description 8:2 9:7
															descriptions 125:7										
															desk 106:9										
															detail 84:19 95:17 125:17,20										
															details 73:25 115:20										
															determination 139:14										
															determinations 68:1 69:11										
															determine 84:21 88:22 157:4 201:23										
															determined 79:9 140:2										
															determines 98:6										
															determining 137:3										
															develop 122:17										
															deviations 144:16										
															dictate 144:8 145:12 151:15										
															dictates 144:10										
															differ 21:11 126:3 133:11 143:5,6,10 144:13 145:5,24 146:11 151:17										
															difference 20:19 50:14 79:23 81:6 81:19 82:15 123:5 125:21 131:16										
															137:22										
															differences 105:12										
															105:15 124:17 125:8 126:10 147:18 151:21 184:2 185:3										
															different 20:18 36:8 41:9 51:5,6 54:10 64:15 65:13										

[different - dropped]

Page 12

69:18 74:17 78:5 87:17 90:6 96:13 96:17 117:10,11 117:13,14,17 119:25 121:15 123:20,24 126:6,8 133:21 141:7,7,8,9 141:17 142:22,23 142:24 143:8 145:12 147:9,11 149:1 150:12 158:15 175:12 184:2 188:1,5 differently 178:14 differs 133:4 difficult 21:2 diovan 185:17,18 186:9 187:10,16 dir 96:6,9,20,22 direct 55:11,12 directed 69:4 78:8 direction 31:6 directly 89:5 92:13 114:7 119:21 121:2 167:6 disaggregated 26:10 147:23 disagree 60:12 discernable 161:2 discounted 148:16 discounts 61:4 145:17 148:19 149:11 166:9,15 167:15,16 discovery 14:3,14 discussed 28:23 29:22 31:22 40:12 49:25 61:20 83:22 186:13,18	discusses 32:12 discussing 102:10 discussion 104:8 155:18 168:13 201:16 discussions 37:10 194:5 dispense 63:12 89:13 92:25 95:22 172:9 dispensed 23:15 24:1 32:24 37:22 40:2,20 41:6,11 42:8 65:21 85:23 89:6 106:24 160:21 171:25 172:19 dispensing 16:24 21:18,24 22:3,18 22:19 23:21 30:14 30:17 36:22 37:3 37:6 39:16 40:3 42:23 49:24 50:4 50:5 61:14,16 63:21 64:8,12,13 88:23 89:9,14,17 89:18 90:5,10,16 90:20,24 91:3,18 91:21 92:7,15,17 92:23 93:2,14,23 93:25 94:7,12,15 94:17,18,20 95:3 95:10,14,17,25 97:5,10,12,15,19 97:20,25 98:1,6,14 98:25 99:1,6 170:4,6,24 171:15 171:22 172:14 173:12 174:7,20 176:20 177:6,7,17 179:13 180:1,5,7	180:10 distinction 20:7 28:24 81:1,16 82:12 distinguishes 81:9 distortion 203:22 distributer 164:18 distributors 99:12 106:21 118:2,8,20 119:3 distribution 121:15 131:6 164:20 distributor 164:8 164:12,23,23 165:2,13,15 distributors 105:23 107:8 116:25 117:7,12 117:21 district 1:1,1 dlesli.davis 4:10 doctor 11:4 110:19 182:21 195:2 doctor's 168:14 document 1:4 19:22 23:4,8 38:22 196:1 197:25 202:1 204:1,2 206:25 207:18,24,25 documents 9:6 11:23 13:14 15:9 17:23 18:1,1,21 19:4 106:8,9 109:20,23,23 110:2 111:5 131:20 207:7,10 doing 31:5,9,18 49:1 53:11 88:4	116:4 147:25 158:9 180:19,20 205:6 dollar 98:17 169:15,21 door 102:10 dorner 3:12 dorsey 6:18 dorsey.com 6:19 dose 172:11 double 20:10,11 20:24 21:3 29:7 31:11,15 108:14 157:2 downstream 30:3 136:5 142:11,17 143:15 144:5 153:1,25 189:5 dozens 107:22 dr 11:15 55:3 68:19 70:24 76:5 87:22 100:13,22 101:8 109:8,11 110:23 111:18 113:2 116:17 122:11 154:4,21 155:23 159:4 162:20 168:4 169:15 183:12,19 200:23 201:22 203:5,10,19 205:13,25 206:18 207:13 draft 195:22 draw 156:5 drew 3:12 drive 4:5 driven 144:18 drop 121:2 dropped 139:22
---	---	---	---

[drug - established]

Page 13

drug 91:16,22,23 92:12,13,14,23 93:4,6,12,13 94:22 98:16 105:5 118:22 131:14 135:9 169:23 173:4 174:12 181:14 182:1 189:5 drugs 5:22 23:15 28:21 37:6,24 51:20 64:2 67:4 75:3 79:15 82:8 86:17 97:19 99:6 103:22 104:24,25 105:22 106:18 113:23 114:3 116:7,23 117:5,10 117:18 118:5 120:22 121:12 123:6 126:3 127:9 131:14 132:16 135:4 139:10 140:6 146:10 154:24 155:7,25 162:10 172:14,20 174:10 180:10 186:1 190:3 191:4 191:19 199:6 dt 81:24 95:13,13 95:18 dtdorner 3:12 duane 3:2,10 duanemorris.com 3:3,4,5,11,12 due 17:17,19	eabraham 5:19 earlier 22:1 97:18 102:22 104:4 111:15 133:24 134:3,9 147:16 148:12 156:20 170:4,11,13 180:1 180:4 181:3 193:1 193:3 194:16,24 196:14 early 37:11 112:22 easiest 49:6 easily 138:10,11 161:2 eastern 1:13 easy 124:6 echo 14:8 economic 84:1 191:4,19,24 192:12 economics 16:7 economist 46:9 47:13 139:9,20 economist's 70:19 ecosystem 102:6 102:18 effect 93:13 effectively 156:14 effects 93:11 efficacy 190:9 eisenhower 2:8 either 77:14 102:24 111:6,25 137:25 148:8 149:1,4 164:4 172:10 198:1 elaborate 73:15 electronic 15:7 111:19,25 112:4 elements 123:20 136:10,11,12	146:22 ellie 4:9 ellie.norris 4:9 email 103:20 employee 110:13 149:19 150:4 employees 135:22 encountered 34:8 ended 204:10 ends 28:10 54:21 100:4 154:13 engage 68:6 engineering 199:8 199:15 enormous 75:2 enrichment 20:5 20:13,17 21:6,12 27:19 47:6 48:3 48:18 49:9,13 50:22 58:5,7,13 59:5,9,18 60:20 61:6,25 62:21 63:24 64:11,24 65:19 74:10 84:5 84:12 115:18,25 116:6,11 122:18 122:23 123:20,22 123:24 124:10,15 125:23 126:1,24 127:5,8,13,16,18 128:11,14 129:3 129:10 130:10 131:12 133:4,10 149:13 169:15,16 171:8,17 184:10 ensure 53:21 135:4 entails 61:8 enter 136:1 entering 136:4 152:9	entire 14:24 136:2 195:12,16,20 entirely 202:9 entirety 30:15 66:24 entities 96:8 103:5 131:8 entitled 20:4 59:17 entity 19:17 144:7 144:18 151:11 entry 108:25 enumerated 28:23 37:14 63:1 171:18 186:13 epedigree 134:5 135:1 147:15 equal 57:4 63:8,10 63:18 65:4 equals 80:22 81:24 84:2 95:13,19 equation 160:25 eric 5:18 154:23 155:2,24 168:2 194:22 errata 210:11,13 210:17 erratas 210:15 especially 172:20 esquire 2:3,7,12 2:16,21,22,23 3:3 3:4,5,6,11,12,17 3:18 4:3,4,9,10,14 4:19 5:3,7,12,13 5:17,18,19 6:3,8,9 6:14,18 7:3,4,8 210:1 essentially 115:23 126:24 established 38:25 41:25 46:13 48:12 140:12
e	elaborate 73:15 electronic 15:7 111:19,25 112:4 elements 123:20 136:10,11,12	ensure 53:21 135:4 entails 61:8 enter 136:1 entering 136:4 152:9	essentially 115:23 126:24 established 38:25 41:25 46:13 48:12 140:12

estimate 75:5,10	executives 103:21	explain 48:2 49:11	falkenberggives.c...
estimates 20:17	exercise 147:20	58:20 73:23 87:23	7:3,4
estimation 74:20	200:11	97:4 171:15	fall 74:11 88:19
122:1	exforge 185:17,20	174:12	familiar 22:4
et 137:24 151:18	exhibit 8:2 15:5	explained 48:1,22	181:22
190:10 192:7	18:6,10,17,23 19:6	49:7 95:11	far 125:9 131:21
198:15 210:4	19:25 20:2 25:1	explanation 73:2	206:15
211:1 212:1	27:7 29:3 31:25	express 4:17 42:5	fast 165:8
events 110:5	34:18 44:3 47:23	156:13 168:24	fault 165:9
evidence 207:1	49:3 51:10 52:6,9	expressed 27:9	favorite 98:5
exact 48:20 58:6	62:5,7,8 107:17	70:20 85:8 89:9	fda 29:17,25
192:5	109:8 202:3	95:18 136:24	188:25 190:9
exactly 50:24 59:2	204:10 206:22	137:21	194:2,17,25
117:24 132:12	207:18 208:1,3,6	extent 16:22 38:10	fda's 199:5
189:15 192:8	exhibits 10:7	45:10 58:16 59:25	february 1:12
examination 10:3	13:10,20 44:9	67:15 76:9 83:18	209:14 210:3
11:14 100:12	202:9	85:25 122:25	fee 22:18 30:14
182:20	exist 145:1 149:4	124:4 125:11	40:3 61:14 63:12
example 55:9 56:3	202:2	126:1,14 139:3	63:21 64:13 89:17
56:4,10 108:24	existence 179:22	149:25 154:3	89:18 92:23 95:25
138:15 143:17	expand 84:18	157:25 158:19	97:5,10,10,16,19
144:24 149:11,19	expect 31:14	167:8 184:5	98:6,14,25 99:6
151:10 164:25	124:22 144:11	f	173:12 174:7,20
172:15	146:11 151:14	f 209:1	179:13 180:5,7
examples 56:11	198:25	fact 12:23 117:3	feel 34:14 53:16
exceeded 201:18	expecting 123:18	170:23 171:23	179:4
202:2	expenditure 77:16	189:11 199:19	fees 23:2,21 36:22
excel 8:4 18:7,19	expenditures 27:8	204:3	49:24 50:4 96:6,9
24:23,24 33:9,16	77:9	factor 88:2 98:20	96:20,22,22 97:20
49:2	expense 182:1	138:2 139:11	97:25 98:1 99:1
exclude 29:20 30:6	experience 106:12	factors 139:21	149:12,12 166:9
49:17 191:14	172:8	faculty 16:8,10,11	170:5,24 171:15
excluded 34:2,3	experienced 130:3	16:15 17:9	171:22
34:12	expert 8:5 46:10	fails 210:19	rhs 6:3
exclusion 20:20	59:25 116:10	fair 15:22 22:6	field 33:10,18,22
161:11 162:6	139:8 156:2 197:8	36:6 157:15	94:5 107:1 135:10
exclusions 51:15	197:17 202:16	162:24 165:18	fields 31:12,13
excuse 28:16	207:18	fairness 201:1	figure 22:9 87:12
68:15 91:6 94:4	expertise 51:7	falanga 6:7	figures 169:15,21
176:23 179:9	expired 203:15	falkenberg 7:2	file 18:7 21:25
197:23 203:1,1,25			24:7,23 26:16

29:3,19 33:4 44:5	131:2,2 136:15	form 43:21 45:9	137:17,18 138:3
44:8,22,25 51:10	171:10 192:18	46:8 49:4 52:7,22	139:5 146:16,17
52:11,16,21 53:5	five 19:16 54:17	53:13 60:11,16	147:1,17 148:1,2,2
53:12 207:23,25	62:13 93:25 99:24	65:6 66:12 67:14	148:4 156:13
208:5	183:4	71:23 74:23 80:1	160:5
files 168:9	flat 82:19	83:17 84:7 85:15	formulas 75:18
filng 69:21 70:9	flexible 51:13	85:24 86:11,22	108:6,7 123:16
fill 30:8 106:19	125:4 139:25	88:11 90:2,18	146:22
filled 36:12 37:18	149:15 165:24	91:24 92:19 98:11	formulated 116:23
39:9 82:7 156:22	185:11	98:22 99:16 115:6	117:5,18
157:17	flipping 109:18	116:1 119:10	formulation 99:4
fillng 90:25	floor 3:19 6:4,10	120:12 127:20	fortune 132:4,5
fills 23:1,22 29:20	6:15	128:20 130:13	153:10
30:7,11,13 33:3	focus 103:4 122:15	131:22 140:25	forward 173:18
36:3,4 41:18 43:6	focused 55:12,17	141:18 143:21	179:7 187:6
filter 25:16,22	56:7,8,11 66:25	145:7 157:20	found 47:22 50:10
51:11 53:5,9,17	67:1 122:1,4	169:25 172:1	frank 6:3
54:9	125:18,21 191:11	174:16 176:16	frankly 39:5
filterng 49:2	folks 101:15 102:2	178:11 181:9,15	fraud 83:16
final 25:5	follow 48:25 54:4	182:2 184:19	free 169:23 173:4
finally 70:20	64:22 78:9 84:8	185:4 186:4,25	freed 145:22
106:23 204:7	104:1 122:12	187:18 189:20	freeman 2:7
finance 102:23	160:4	190:5 191:6 193:8	frequency 33:24
199:7	following 41:13	193:24 194:14	frequently 30:4
financing 102:11	51:24,24 52:23	196:3 204:12	172:20
find 61:23 138:9	55:10 73:24 80:3	format 43:17	friday 1:11
138:24 168:10	83:11 170:20	former 103:20	friends 152:5
finding 59:7	food 189:5	forms 186:21	front 155:10 156:3
finds 65:11	footnote 28:9,9,9	formula 77:19	198:7
fine 73:9 75:16	28:11,23 48:11	78:2,4,6,18 79:7	fulbright 4:8
finish 106:20	61:20 74:11	79:18 84:4,12,17	full 15:2 19:22
148:22 176:24	110:15,20 118:1	84:22,24 85:8,11	35:13 57:4 60:10
203:2 205:6	118:17,18 138:7	85:21 86:6 87:6	60:25 61:1 63:8
finished 83:6	139:23,24 148:7	87:15 88:21 89:2	63:18 65:4 67:11
159:9 172:10	156:25 186:13,23	89:7,10 90:1	71:21 72:10,15,16
firm 155:24	192:18	91:20 92:4,18	74:13 77:9,16
first 11:20 27:18	footnotes 55:23	93:20 94:10,11,12	79:7,13 129:21
41:24 57:25 81:14	74:18	94:24 95:1,2,2,8,8	130:4 181:7
81:24 84:20	foregoing 209:5	95:12,18 115:24	192:10,12,15
109:16 111:14	212:5	124:14 126:10,23	function 40:16
118:18 122:15		127:5 136:18,24	89:10 177:2

[fundamental - growing]

Page 16

fundamental 157:23	146:10 151:11 172:20 185:16 188:13 190:2 191:3,18 199:5	73:1,6 75:17 77:7 81:19 83:3 84:11 85:7 88:21 89:7 95:1,16 106:18	goldberg 3:3 11:4 11:5 58:1 195:10 195:18 205:11,20 205:22 206:4,8,14 207:3
funny 71:17	geoffrey 6:14	110:21 111:17	gonna 205:11
further 111:13 167:25 184:6 209:9	geoppinger 7:8	116:15 122:8,10	good 11:4,15 45:11 53:17,20 68:1 99:22 100:13
g	getting 70:22 108:14 132:19	127:24 130:22 136:17 148:1	154:8,8,21,22 155:23 182:21 183:12,15,20 189:17 194:13,13
g 44:7,19 45:22 47:19 51:8,12 52:16 53:4	gisleson 3:17	154:9 166:21	goods 137:24 138:18 145:16 150:1,2,12 152:10 175:24 177:12 178:10
g.1 44:24 47:24 51:6	gist 151:5	168:21 171:4,5,7	gordon 6:2
g.1. 44:20,21 53:4	give 11:10 19:24 32:10 56:10	171:10,12 172:4 194:16,25 196:18	gotcha 12:15
gained 131:18	109:13 156:7 157:1 198:12	196:21,21,23 198:24 200:4,21	great 11:23 75:21 100:1 120:8 142:19 189:10
gannon 6:8	200:24	201:2,12 202:20 203:24 205:8	greenberg 4:2 183:1
gap 150:14 153:13	given 26:10 37:12 45:18 52:17 90:20	goes 23:22 66:15 90:23 94:21	greg 4:4 182:24 183:13 204:23,23
gateway 6:10	90:20 93:3,3 108:25 114:1	111:21 155:3	gross 61:22 103:13 137:23 138:8,18 138:21,21
gcoan 6:14	116:21 125:7 135:9 144:12,25	going 11:7,17 18:5 19:23 20:9 27:25	group 15:13 33:2 66:4 74:2 80:7 117:12 183:13
geman 2:16	145:14 166:15 167:15 202:4	29:9 53:19 54:14 55:6 56:10 65:18	grouping 44:22,25
general 42:12 119:24 120:7,8 127:15 131:13 137:18 139:5 142:25 143:8 144:6,17 145:13 145:13 148:25 151:5 152:1 153:23	212:9	65:24 67:24 69:16 70:4 75:25 87:3 99:19 100:4,14,17	groupings 45:7,16 46:4,12,21 51:4,7 51:18 52:4
generally 97:4 103:1 123:23 124:7 143:2 151:13 152:5	giving 59:16 91:1 91:12 93:8	109:8,16 111:15 113:4 114:2	groups 79:25 80:4 80:8 106:23
generate 22:10 23:3 25:1 39:15	glaxosmithkline 8:7 197:10,13,19	117:20 118:19 122:14 133:16	growing 96:20
generated 24:7 39:17 65:2	198:15 199:23 202:17 207:21	135:15,17 143:18 144:18 146:16	
generation 64:18 64:19	glenside 1:12	154:13 155:3,8,17	
generic 82:8,20,21 92:23 98:16 99:3 116:23 117:5,18	go 15:19 26:25 27:6 28:13 29:2,6	173:18 174:8 175:11 176:2,3	
	32:5 34:17 35:25 36:2 42:3 44:10	178:5,6 179:3,7 180:14 182:16,23	
	44:18 46:17 47:25 49:6 51:16 53:4	183:7,23 187:25 188:4,9 197:2,4,6	
	53:21,23 54:11 56:21 58:4,20	200:19 201:4,14	
	60:18 61:6 62:19 64:21 65:13,24	203:14 205:14	

gtlaw.com 4:3,4	healthcare 3:9,15	64:21 73:17 77:21	174:14,23 175:1,4
guess 120:16	hear 14:9 18:23	80:8 82:3 120:22	175:15,19,25
148:3 192:24	27:3 35:2 59:21	122:12 144:4	178:11 179:8,17
guys 194:20	62:18 100:22	146:19,19 174:14	180:14,20 181:9
h			
h 6:3 8:1 44:7,19	101:1,3 105:19	176:23 182:22,25	181:15 182:2,7,10
47:19 51:8,12	119:15 131:25	195:23	182:13,17 183:5
52:16 211:3	154:24 155:13	holds 144:7,18	184:4,19 185:4
h.1 46:16,18 47:24	169:3 178:21,22	151:11	186:4,25 187:18
51:6	205:3	honestly 12:16	189:20 191:6
h.1. 47:3	held 151:25	23:9 126:18	193:8,15,24
h.2 56:22 64:20,21	155:18 201:16	honik 2:2,3 45:9	194:14,22 195:5
64:25 65:2	help 140:5 182:14	45:20 46:8 49:4	196:3 197:23
h.2. 56:17,21	helpful 28:6 51:2	52:7,22 53:13	201:8,13,18
half 14:9	82:14 200:12	54:19 58:15 59:24	202:23 203:14,21
hand 77:10,19	henry 5:3	60:11,16 62:9	205:10,18,21
120:23 209:14	hereto 212:7	65:6 66:12 67:14	206:2,12,15 208:8
handful 103:9	hereunto 209:13	67:18 68:15,25	208:10 210:1
handing 94:21	hetero 5:22,22	70:16 71:14,23	honiklaw.com 2:3
handled 117:11	25:12 69:21	72:13,24 74:23	210:2
118:8	154:23,24 155:7,8	76:8,17 79:10	hope 183:17
handles 118:2	155:25,25 156:20	80:1,10,15 83:8,12	hospitals 106:22
handling 146:14	158:20 160:2,12	83:17 84:7,14	117:15 121:13,24
hang 204:25 205:1	161:12,13 163:4	85:15,24 86:11,22	hour 26:2,11
happens 30:3	165:2 167:8,15	87:7,14,18,22	154:2 201:19
happy 33:13 42:3	168:5	88:11 90:2,18	202:2 204:3,5,5
73:6 94:25 103:24	hetero's 157:4	91:24 92:19 97:6	hours 68:23
161:3,23 163:2,6	163:15 164:7,19	98:11,22 99:16,20	107:22,22 108:1
178:25 194:16,24	165:12,12 166:10	99:24 100:7	108:10
196:18 201:2	highlight 81:23	112:10 115:6	huahai 3:8,9,15,15
hard 27:3 154:3	highlighted 131:3	116:1 119:10	hudson 2:17
head 16:7 75:14	hill 3:4 5:17	120:12 122:24	huge 132:8 150:7
103:19,25 108:12	155:24	124:3,18 125:10	huh 63:7 85:6
110:14 111:4	hillwallack.com	126:13 127:20	185:21
116:13 164:10	5:18,19,20	128:20,24 130:13	humana 7:6
heading 15:7	hilton 2:23	131:22 139:2,12	hunchuck 3:18
health 5:15 70:19	hinshaw 6:13	140:9,25 141:18	husch 4:14 168:20
111:6,11 112:1	hinshawlaw.com	143:21 145:7	168:23
113:12 139:8	6:14	153:7 154:1,9	huschblackwell....
143:17	hoc 199:6,11,14	155:2 157:20	4:15
	hold 26:5 32:6,6	159:8 168:2,15	hyman 2:16
	55:20 56:6,18	169:25 172:1	

[hypothetical - instruction]

Page 18

hypothetical 68:7 68:12 69:8,17 70:18 72:2 92:9 92:10,21 140:10 140:12 165:18 189:15 hypothetically 140:4 hypotheticals 188:8	205:23 improper 70:18 140:10 202:10 204:10 impure 163:17 impurity 157:7,19 158:21 incentives 141:15 inceptions 26:16 include 25:3,13 30:17 41:10 43:22 49:23 61:3,9,18 63:21 66:16 85:21 86:21 88:9,17 89:15 91:1 103:6 103:7,11 137:16 138:16 140:7,17 140:23 143:1 178:9 included 17:15 21:15 30:5 36:3 36:22 37:13 39:9 40:24 43:5,5 50:23 57:10,13 66:9 93:20,22 137:17 138:10,12 138:24 139:1 140:2 149:8,21 158:23 166:4,17 166:19 170:24 includes 41:2 106:21 183:14 194:5 including 34:14 40:14 63:12 78:18 86:8 88:4 148:5 175:23 177:11 207:8 inclusion 20:20 47:15 51:15 161:11 162:6	inclusions 140:1 inclusive 61:11 66:17 137:19 138:4 incorrect 189:11 incredible 23:12 incremental 91:14 93:3 incurred 64:8 independent 12:9 70:10 index 10:7 indiana 5:9 indianapolis 5:9 indicate 108:20 indicated 20:23 182:1 202:19 indicator 20:22 individual 23:2 30:14 151:8 173:16 177:8 individuals 85:22 103:16 industries 4:7 industry 12:25 16:20 43:1 46:10 94:19 96:8 101:14 102:5 103:2 118:10,12 119:4 172:8 180:6 181:22 industry's 78:24 information 16:24 24:2 26:7,19,22 30:12,13 33:6,6 34:15 36:24 37:13 38:1,2,11,12 39:25 40:24 42:7 45:17 46:23 48:14 49:20 49:25 93:9 114:15 126:4 134:23	136:8 150:4 157:23 158:11 163:20 167:24 176:18 191:21 192:3,5,15 199:25 200:20 informed 16:25 106:13 informs 107:4 infused 106:24 117:10 ingersoll 4:18 5:2 ingested 190:15 ingredient 99:2 172:11 ingredients 98:20 106:19 injected 106:24 117:10 injury 32:23,25 167:3 173:10 177:17 input 79:7 135:8 inputs 137:2,12 138:15 150:16 inputting 91:15 insist 202:2 inssofar 70:17 instance 70:15 instantaneous 172:18 institutional 200:5 institutions 200:9 instructed 193:11 193:14,15,16 instruction 115:13 115:14 125:3 126:15,20 127:14 127:17 149:2,3,16 184:22
i			
i.1 46:16 47:5,10 51:6 i.1. 47:4,5,24 i.2 58:4 62:17 63:4 64:19,24 65:3 i.2. 62:19,20 i.3 62:17 ice 71:16 idea 53:16 118:14 175:22 177:10 178:7 identification 18:11 208:7 identified 17:24 26:20 29:14 95:11 identifier 43:14 illinois 4:5 7:5 ilyse 209:17 imaginable 204:13 imagine 61:15 immediately 172:19 impact 19:18 35:8 35:12 164:3 165:21 implied 45:24 important 103:5 107:1 117:9 120:17 148:13 153:12 155:7			

instructions 9:3 51:25 52:5 124:24 184:25	invoice 108:23 invoices 207:8 involved 107:2 114:1 199:24	185:9 items 150:8 ives 7:2,3	18:5,14 19:13,15 20:1 23:8 24:4,17 24:19 27:5 29:2,4
insurance 23:18 30:11,15 40:17 63:11,15 67:2 77:20 79:19,24 80:6,18,24 81:2,5 81:13,18 82:10,16 82:22 97:24 176:17	involves 101:11 involving 104:6 iqvia 50:10 66:15 122:4 160:19 161:10,21,23 166:20 167:10,11 186:17	j j 2:16,22 5:12,19 jamie 1:14 128:21 208:11 209:3,17	32:5,8,11 34:4,17 34:19 38:16 40:22 45:5,13,14 46:1,14 52:10 53:1,15 54:13,18 55:2 57:15 59:15,23 60:6,14 62:1,15 64:16 65:7 66:19
insured 22:23 36:25 39:22 77:20 79:18,23 80:6,16 80:23 81:2,5,12,15 81:17 82:5	irbesartan 1:3 issue 22:15 24:11 25:6 26:1 27:8,20 27:22 28:14 29:13 30:1 32:1 37:24 37:24,25 48:4,6,8 48:12,14 50:9,20 52:17 53:24 57:5 57:13 67:4,5,5	janow 4:19 january 27:21 48:8	66:22 67:22 68:24 69:15,25 70:7 71:16,19 72:3,19 73:3 75:4,15,23 76:4,15,20 77:18
insurer 36:23 39:23 82:9,11	71:22 72:11 79:15 84:2 85:23 86:10 86:17,17 104:25 113:10,18,22	jdavis 2:12 jeffrey 7:8 jersey 1:1 2:9 5:21 6:11	78:1 79:16 80:5 80:11,19 82:1 83:14,24 84:9,15
insurers 23:25 97:25	114:14 116:7,22 117:4,19 118:9,13 118:23 119:1	jgeoppinger 7:9 john 2:12 3:17 john.gisleson 3:18 joining 45:12	84:16 85:19 86:5 86:19 87:2,5,9,10 87:21,24 88:16
intelligence 43:10	121:18,19,23	jonathan 4:19 jonathan.janow 4:19	90:7,22 91:19 92:3 93:16 96:21
intended 58:11 73:13 74:14	122:19 123:10	judge 14:4,4,5,15 14:15,19,20	97:14 98:3,13 99:9,18 170:14,16
intending 58:11 77:4	124:12 126:3,19	126:15 166:6	kara 5:7 11:12,16
interaction 106:4	128:5 129:18	june 198:13	45:11 68:18 71:15
interest 11:9	131:7,18 135:24	jury 61:23 65:11 69:12 124:25	77:11 80:15 87:19
interested 209:11	144:1 146:7	125:2,3 126:15,21	170:16
interplay 66:3	162:10,10,11,14	138:8,23 140:1	kara.kapke 5:8
interpreted 89:17	169:18 172:21	149:3,7,17,22	kathy 170:15
interrupt 166:22 174:23,24 203:4,5	173:22 186:12,16	150:19 185:1,12	katz 2:7
interrupted 198:23	187:5,9,13,15	jury's 69:5	kbi 7:3
introduce 18:5	188:19 193:5,22	7:13 201:9	keep 19:23 134:6
invade 125:11	194:4 205:23	k	134:23 136:7
invades 112:11	issues 101:12	k 3:17 4:20	155:3
invention 199:8	102:11 132:14	kanner 2:20,21,22 2:23	keeping 135:11,23
investigation 157:3		kapke 5:7 10:4 11:14,16 14:6,11 16:13 17:3,5,21	207:5
			keeps 147:13 150:10

[kept - line]

Page 20

kept 43:15	173:2 180:24	law 124:2,23	134:24,25 136:7
kind 31:8 70:22	188:7 189:21	125:8 155:24	147:4
126:6 127:15	201:3 205:4	184:17	levels 158:15
131:12 152:5	knowledge 41:1	law.com 2:21,22	lewis 3:17
kirstin 7:3	194:8,11	2:23	lhilton 2:23
klinges 3:6	known 114:17,18	laws 46:6	liability 1:3 20:6
knepper 4:14	158:17 188:23	lawsuit 69:21	20:12,17 21:5,10
168:19,20,23	knows 94:19,19	70:10,11	37:12 46:6 47:14
169:5,8,12 170:1,9	147:13	lawyer 46:11,25	48:21 49:9,13
170:12 171:20	kroger 42:4	47:10,13 71:6	50:21,21 58:21,24
172:4,6 174:25	ks 12:13	115:19 123:2	59:1,3,11,18 60:19
175:2,8,11,13,17	kugler's 14:19,20	124:11 139:19	60:21,25 61:25
175:20 176:21	I	lawyerly 204:12	64:15,25 65:17
178:2,4,15,19	I.l.c. 2:20	laying 116:4	66:5,17 67:1,3
179:2,11,12,24	label 51:20 93:8	layne 2:23	69:3 73:25 74:5,8
180:17 181:1,10	99:12	lbresnaham 5:12	74:12,17 84:3
181:20 182:5,9,11	labeled 20:3 30:2	lchb.com 2:17	124:9 126:8
182:16	187:4	leave 205:25	156:14 167:2
knew 158:2 192:4	labeling 103:22	left 33:9 67:12	184:10
know 14:16 16:22	labor 90:25 93:10	68:13 70:15 195:6	liable 115:17
21:4 23:13 24:21	94:20 99:5,7	201:21	license 209:17
33:11 34:22 36:4	laboratories 6:5	legal 7:14 45:10,16	lieff 2:16
39:3,14 41:21,21	labs 5:22 154:23	46:6,24 47:9,12	life 16:15 110:5
42:18 53:3 58:2	155:8,25 160:2,12	58:16 59:25 67:15	146:15
67:25 68:1 73:4	161:13	68:21 69:2 70:14	limit 50:8 201:19
80:25,25 83:7	lack 129:5	83:18 85:25 86:12	202:3 204:3,5,6
92:16 95:24 96:3	ladder 205:9	86:23 119:11	limitations 36:19
98:8,9,12 99:17	laid 115:1 193:12	120:13 122:25	36:21
102:13 106:20	193:17	124:4 126:14	limited 5:22,22 6:6
108:10,16 109:11	language 57:21	139:3,7,14 145:8	14:17,17 37:4
110:5,12 116:18	large 145:18	184:6 210:23	40:10 49:16
117:23 118:23,24	largely 20:20	legitimate 187:10	115:23 124:23
119:2,16 127:15	117:20,22 118:4	187:12,16 190:1	159:3 174:25
131:13 132:6	121:16 122:2,4	190:11	176:14
134:13,14,19	larger 19:14 30:11	legs 206:19	limiting 26:23
146:10 150:7	144:3 147:6	length 31:22	line 9:4,7,10,13
152:15 155:4	176:13	186:14,18	80:21 150:8
157:25 159:15,18	largest 74:25	letters 13:23	159:25 173:19
160:24 161:15,16	late 45:12 154:7	level 26:21 42:23	201:2,2 203:24,24
163:15,23 164:7	laughed 71:18	43:13 74:2 119:6	211:4,7,10,13,16
164:11,17 167:16		124:22 134:16,23	211:19

list 29:17,24,25 48:3 84:17 109:23 110:3,8 187:2	logistics 149:12 long 16:4 176:25 look 31:10,12,12 44:20 46:17 55:10 56:14,15 63:17 94:24 118:5 143:18 154:8 162:1,21 168:9 196:19 198:10 202:1,12 204:1	ma'am 35:9 36:5 39:1,14 198:4 madam 100:25 204:25 mail 32:17,25 50:16 169:7 mailed 32:19,20 32:20,22 33:1 50:18 main 110:21 maintain 102:16 135:3 maintained 134:4 major 132:4 143:11 majority 116:23 117:6,23 making 71:14 82:13,13 99:13 154:25 158:3,5,7 management 54:10 151:15 manager 169:7 179:14,23 180:12 manager's 179:16 manner 151:14 203:13 manufacture 132:25 manufactured 128:6 158:20 manufacturer 23:19 25:7,10,20 26:21 28:25 29:13 29:17 35:15 40:13 51:18 52:4 56:9 58:22 59:7 60:9 66:4,10,18 67:3,6 89:5 92:13 105:10 114:7 123:7 134:24 142:6	150:21,21 151:1 151:11,13 152:14 153:5,5 157:24 158:16 159:18 165:12 188:24 192:5 manufacturers 28:22 29:24 30:3 37:25 48:16 57:13 58:10 64:5 67:8 68:7,10 70:11 73:13 74:1,6,13 103:4,12 105:21 113:23 114:2,17 119:6 120:22 121:2 133:18 134:12 135:4 136:3,9 142:8 151:17,23 152:8 152:17,22 167:1 184:1 188:13 189:4 manufacturing 106:20 194:13 marginal 90:24 91:3,3 mark 18:6 33:18 202:3 marked 9:12 18:10 70:13 202:6 204:16,21,24 208:6 market 2:4 30:4 74:21 75:3 102:21 114:1 118:3 119:8 120:11 123:9 135:18 142:7 143:12,12 144:4,8 144:19 151:7 157:24 158:13
listing 15:9	looking 30:21		
lists 32:2	56:13 78:6 79:18		
literally 26:2,11 78:23	80:20 87:6 89:23		
literature 175:21 178:7 179:6	94:13 105:12,15		
litigation 1:3 14:21 18:3 140:7 146:3,8	105:17 106:12		
little 19:14 34:15 101:2 108:13 111:13 120:25 123:12 151:17 185:5 199:3	168:11		
live 38:4 192:14	looks 132:11 143:8		
livenote 1:15	losartan 1:2 210:4		
liza 6:9	211:1 212:1		
llc 2:2 3:9,15 4:21 5:5	lost 77:12		
llp 2:11,16 3:2,10 3:17 4:2,8 5:7,11 5:17 6:2,7,13,18 7:2,8	lot 13:14 30:12		
located 32:13 50:16	39:14 101:8 102:4		
location 32:25	105:18 108:8		
logistically 25:16	118:24 129:3		
	132:19 133:18		
	194:3		
	lots 68:21,22 152:4		
	loud 27:2		
	louis 4:16		
	louisiana 2:24		
	love 140:12 188:8		
	low 82:8 101:3		
	luke 5:12		
	lwalsh 6:9		
	m		
	m 1:11 2:5,7 4:3 4:10 5:7 6:9,14 10:2 209:6		

[marking - mischaracterizing]

Page 22

marking 20:2	mazieslater.com	measures 184:3	139:24 148:24
mash 87:18	2:8	mechanical 86:15	149:15 151:6
mashing 87:19	mckesson 4:12	87:16 89:21 90:14	185:11 186:3
massachusetts	111:6,11 112:1	122:1 124:11	methodology
6:15	113:12	126:19	70:25 122:17
massive 42:21	mdl 1:2	mechanically 65:8	156:13 162:7
144:2	mean 24:18 30:24	88:14 116:3	171:8
master 14:3,14	31:1 32:19 34:5	125:16,25 148:23	microphone 101:5
match 50:19	36:4,20 37:1	mechanism	million 69:23
147:24	40:25 41:4,22	203:19	118:7 135:16
matched 48:17	42:18 45:8 55:20	media 11:2 54:21	160:13 161:7
material 190:8	58:23 65:8 66:1,2	54:25 100:4,10	162:4
materially 143:5	67:10 71:6 72:16	154:13,18	millions 23:13
materials 11:24	73:6,15 74:15	medical 106:23	172:15
18:8 20:3,8	78:20,22 81:1,3	199:16	mine 69:9
127:11	86:14 87:7 90:9	medication 171:24	minus 48:6 61:11
mathematical	94:25 102:25	172:10,23	65:20,20 84:18
68:22	106:16 109:1	medicine's 199:8	94:10 95:9 126:25
matt.knepper	113:16 114:4	199:15	127:19 129:24
4:15	117:6 119:13,23	meet 13:23 154:7	minute 26:2,11
matter 8:7 16:17	120:16,16 125:21	meetings 102:10	148:21,22 156:9
17:4,12,15 86:23	125:24 132:4	megan 7:4	195:6
103:24 104:19	134:10 135:10	members 85:22	minutes 54:17
109:24 116:6	136:12 141:2,11	86:10 104:18	99:24 123:17
117:20 119:24	143:10 145:1	114:18 135:2	183:4,22 204:2
120:7,8 122:1	148:6 150:6,24	136:5 142:13	misbranded 27:24
126:2 128:4	152:12,13 164:22	membership	48:10 186:2,10
130:11 131:13	164:22 165:4,11	86:23	188:14 189:8
132:14,17 141:23	165:14 166:22	mentioned 14:18	190:2,7 191:3,18
142:25 143:19	170:18 171:7	25:9 28:11 51:19	193:5,23 194:10
144:7 145:10	182:5 183:21	63:20 93:5 99:10	misbranding
146:4 152:3	194:15 196:4,18	102:22 104:4	186:20 192:7,20
153:23 175:1	200:14	107:16 133:24	mischaracteriz...
199:21 204:3	means 34:13 46:4	147:16 148:10,19	171:3
matters 65:16	93:15 182:18	149:10 152:19	mischaracterizes
133:15 177:19	196:6	198:22	193:9
matthew 4:14	meant 80:17	merely 204:1	mischaracterizing
110:9,12 168:20	119:16	meridian 5:8	143:24 202:24
maz 7:4	measure 123:25	met 190:8	205:18
mazie 2:7	127:12 128:3,10	method 51:13	
	184:17	78:23 125:4 139:4	

misconduct 27:11 27:13,14	moskowitz 1:14 209:3,17	name's 183:12	never 34:7 54:7 104:13,16 152:6
mismatch 57:21	motion 168:8	named 17:15 106:6 179:6	new 1:1 2:9,18,18 2:24 5:21 6:11,20
missing 31:15,16	move 44:2 54:14 131:13,15 173:18 178:15 179:7,8 190:25 204:14,16	names 24:10 105:5 105:10	6:20 51:11 52:16 52:17 53:6 199:17 200:20
missouri 4:16	moved 129:18,22 150:13 173:16	national 40:5 199:7,14	newark 6:11
misspoke 80:16 111:15	movement 129:20	native 43:17 44:12 161:21 163:4	news 183:15 202:8
mistakenly 43:22	moving 123:13 127:9 130:17 132:13 172:15	nature 163:17	nice 183:21
mistakes 53:23	mulberry 6:10	ndc 22:17 24:10 25:7,20 26:20,20 29:14,21,24 30:5	night 11:24 102:24
mix 121:1	multiple 31:23,23 39:5 62:9,12,13 64:2,3,4,5 74:12	34:21 35:5 40:14 50:10 51:18,21 52:4 54:5 57:13 59:7 118:22,24	nitrosamine 157:6 157:19 166:12
model 181:3	multiplied 136:25 162:3	119:6 133:19 134:24 186:15,24 187:2,3	nitrosamines 157:13
molecule 116:22 117:5	multiply 137:13 137:16	ndcs 25:12 30:1 160:10	noise 27:2 105:19 132:19 155:13,15
moment 163:18 172:2 173:1,8,9 191:8	murtha 5:17	necessarily 165:11 167:2	nominal 98:18
momentarily 11:6	mute 11:13 194:21	necessary 212:6	non 42:11 43:6 149:18 188:23
moments 160:5	mylan 6:5,6 69:22 103:11 118:18	necessity 66:7	190:2,2 191:3,3,18 191:18 192:7,7
monday 13:2	n	need 21:3 51:2,7 52:14,15,18 54:6 79:3 88:1 110:23 154:4 159:6 173:2 207:2	normal 31:8 102:3 110:5
money 72:11 89:4 127:8 130:16 176:11 178:9	n 2:1 3:1,18 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1	needed 135:8	normally 107:12
monroe 7:5	name 11:15 19:17 25:6,7,11 30:17 34:20,21 35:5 39:19 40:4,13,13 100:14 133:18 154:23 155:23 178:6 185:25 186:9 187:10,16 198:3	needs 68:9 194:20	norris 4:9
month 22:15 23:20 25:3,5,10,19 25:21 26:19 40:14 161:22 184:14 186:15	negotiate 152:8	negotiated 98:10 167:9	north 5:4
months 107:18 108:16	neither 209:9	neither 209:9	norton 4:8
morgan 3:17	net 127:10 137:23 138:22	network 179:16 180:8	nortonrosefulbri... 4:9,10
morganlewis.com 3:18,19	network 179:16 180:8		notary 209:4 212:13,19
moring 5:11			note 47:6 58:15 59:13,24 68:15,16 69:25 70:16 76:8 112:10,10 122:24 124:3 125:10
morning 11:4,15 11:24 45:11 68:4 100:13 102:23,24 170:17			126:13 139:2,12 140:9 154:2 168:3 174:7 183:23 184:4 210:10
morris 3:2,10			
mortar 32:15			

CONFIDENTIAL

[noted - ones]

Page 24

noted 46:18 124:19 212:7	131:22 140:25 141:18 143:21	offered 84:4,5 181:24 204:7	95:4 97:3 99:24 100:13,21,22,24
notes 45:21 63:17 209:8	145:7 157:20 169:25 172:1	offering 115:3,16	101:1,4,20 104:1
notice 207:14	174:14,16 178:11	office 199:5	104:10 107:21
number 8:2 11:2 17:25 39:21 40:6 54:21,25 68:17,23 68:25 69:23 70:2 70:2 100:4,10 103:20 108:10 109:2 118:2,24 154:13,18 160:16 160:17,24 161:5,7 161:16,17 187:3 201:19,19 206:20 206:21	181:9,15 182:2 184:6,19 185:4 186:4,25 187:18 189:20 191:6 193:8,24 194:14 196:3 202:5,12 203:16 204:13	offline 168:13	108:4 109:5,15
numbers 18:3 35:23 53:6 65:2 72:22 141:15 162:23	objecting 38:12	offset 50:4,6 65:22 138:8 148:11 166:18 171:18	110:8 113:6,7 116:19 118:13 119:1,23 120:6
numerous 184:9 192:22	objection 38:9 39:11 58:15 59:24 68:16 69:1 70:16 70:21 72:13,24	offsets 61:3,18,22 63:14 130:2 137:24 148:8	122:13 123:1,16 129:2 130:20,23 131:5,19 133:9
nw 3:13 5:14	76:8,11,17 79:10 97:6 112:11,13 122:24 124:3,18 125:10 126:13	oh 35:10 71:17 72:8 83:10 110:15	136:17,21 137:15 140:11 142:6,16
o	139:2,12 140:9 153:7 175:25 179:17 180:17 184:4	ohio 7:10	142:19,20 148:1
o'clock 154:2	objections 125:14	okay 12:15,15 13:3 14:7,12,24	150:16,23 151:5
o'reilly 6:7	obtained 91:23 169:23	15:4,13,16,20	152:18 153:21
oath 11:21	obviously 113:25 200:9	17:16 19:19,23,23 22:6,22 24:13	155:6 156:5,10,11
object 45:9 46:8 49:4 52:7,22 53:13 60:11,16 65:6 66:12 67:14 71:23 74:23 80:1 83:17 84:7 85:15 85:24 86:11,22 88:11 90:2,11,18 91:24 92:19 98:11 98:22 99:16 115:6 116:1 119:10 120:12 127:20 128:20 130:13	occupy 119:25	26:4,13 27:6 29:2 29:12,18 32:9,10 34:25 35:7,25 36:6 39:7 42:17	156:12,19,24 158:19 161:25
	occurred 33:20,24 33:24 61:19 69:20 69:20 70:9 143:9 165:20 173:10	42:20 44:10,18,24 44:24 46:15 47:1 47:17 49:5 54:14	164:7,11 165:1,6
	occurrence 33:12	55:6 56:12,20,22 57:3,9 60:18	166:7,23 167:23
	occurs 32:23 143:8 167:4 177:18	62:16,20,20 64:24 64:25 66:1 69:16 72:8 73:5 75:17 75:21,23 76:21	170:22 171:21 172:4,7 173:18
	offer 71:14 84:21	77:2 78:8,10,21 79:3,17 81:8 82:2 83:3,10,13 84:10 84:11 85:7,10,20 87:2,14,21,25 88:8	178:15 182:17 183:5,24 184:16
		88:21 90:8,13 92:8,20 94:13	184:25 185:25 186:8,19 187:25
			188:14,20 189:14
			189:24 190:25,25
			191:14 192:13,16
			192:24 194:23
			198:5,9,13,22
			200:7 205:6,8
			206:8,9
			old 206:12
			once 53:12 59:4
			ones 17:15 25:25
			42:1 43:20 69:11
			103:23 117:19
			163:24,24,25
			172:21

ongoing 69:1	original 53:21	packages 147:5	paper 28:7 91:10
opaque 107:11	54:11 196:1,4	packs 147:7	118:6,6
open 31:19 207:5	orleans 2:24	page 8:2 9:1,4,7,10	papers 16:6,21
opened 31:22	ostfeld 4:4 10:6	9:13 10:4,5,6,7	105:14
operate 142:7	182:18,20,24,24	28:4 45:23 46:18	paragraph 15:2
operating 102:20	183:1,11,13	50:3 57:16 73:22	27:7,24 28:1,10
opinion 14:24	184:15,24 185:14	82:4 89:7 109:2	32:4,7,9 49:6,8,11
38:20 45:6 46:11	185:20,24 186:7	109:17 111:14,16	55:16,19,24 61:7
46:21,24 47:9,12	187:7,24 189:23	111:17,18,21	73:7,7,21,21,23
47:14 59:16,25	191:13 193:19	130:22 146:17	75:18 77:8,23
70:20 84:5 122:25	194:7,20 195:1,7,9	148:4 156:8	78:3,3,7,9 83:3,5
124:4 129:6	196:7 198:2 200:6	159:23 169:13	84:12 112:22
138:25 139:8	202:13 203:1,21	171:5,10 198:10	113:8,14 116:15
187:11 189:25	204:20,25 206:21	198:13,24 211:4,7	116:21 118:1,18
191:7 194:12	207:4,16,17 208:9	211:10,13,16,19	122:8 127:1,25
opinions 11:18	ostfeldg 4:4	pages 15:6 108:6,9	128:2,7,17 130:22
14:2,13,19,20	outcome 209:11	108:11 109:18	130:23 132:24
16:16 17:7 46:5	outlined 27:17	111:22	136:19 138:14
100:15,19 106:13	162:7	paid 23:19 30:10	156:6 160:6 171:6
114:23 115:3,16	outpatient 117:15	35:13,21 39:24	171:11,12,14
115:22	121:24	40:16 49:16,21	172:5,8 173:20,21
opportunity 11:10	output 8:3 18:7,17	50:12 57:4 60:10	192:18 199:1,1,2,3
33:14 201:25	18:18 20:4 21:25	60:21 61:1,10,11	202:20,20
202:4,11	24:7 26:16 29:3	63:8,19 64:1,10	paragraphs 27:18
opposed 57:22	29:19 33:4 44:5,8	65:4,18,19 67:8	28:18 48:1,23
optum 42:4	51:10 52:11,16,21	68:10 69:22 78:13	83:23 115:2
optumrx 6:21	53:5,12	78:19 79:14 82:23	parkway 2:8
oral 97:19 98:16	outside 60:5 67:21	82:25 84:3 86:16	part 13:1 27:14
orally 116:23	69:13 70:14 71:2	86:21 88:10 97:18	31:17 45:17 79:17
117:5,18	71:12 92:11,11	105:8 128:4	81:14 102:6,6
orals 118:4	140:6	129:23,24 137:23	103:1 107:9
oranges 59:8	overhead 149:19	137:23 138:19	120:17 126:6
order 32:17,25	overlap 200:10	143:2 159:16	136:18 137:16,25
50:16 51:21 70:4	owed 65:15	160:21 161:10	137:25 138:22
98:17 132:7 169:7	oxford 3:19 6:4	162:9 167:4,12	145:23 147:14
181:2	p	174:5 176:16	148:4 179:15
organization	p	181:13	180:8 199:2
102:12	2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1	painfully 178:12	particular 17:4
organizations	5:1,1 6:1,1 7:1,1	pale 204:11	26:9 33:3,3 35:14
117:12	p.m. 154:5,12,16	panels 102:9	59:19,23 60:8,8
	154:16 201:15	103:17	64:9 65:22 114:11
	208:13		

[particular - pharmacy]

Page 26

139:10 140:6	payment 22:20	percentage 74:21	pharma 3:21
141:13 151:19	23:18 40:17 63:16	75:6,11 82:22	pharmaceutical
152:10 156:15	67:2 71:7,9,10	114:11 117:24	3:8,8,14,15 12:25
particularly 82:7	78:23 81:18 82:10	118:15 119:2	16:20 43:1 46:10
parts 108:20 196:8	88:15 166:18	perfect 77:2	96:8 103:2,4
196:12,19 201:23	payments 23:24	period 25:1 26:9	118:3 151:8
party 22:21 49:17	36:23 63:11,12,13	26:11,23 27:10,13	pharmaceuticals
61:2,11 65:14	67:4 77:9,17	27:20 28:16,22	4:6 6:6,12,16
97:11 157:10	78:25 82:19 96:7	31:24 35:18 57:5	pharmacies 16:23
158:1 159:14	164:11,17 165:2	57:8,14 64:9	17:14 23:11,17,23
160:22 163:22	165:11 176:10,15	80:23 84:24 85:4	25:18,24 26:8
164:19 165:16	176:17 177:3	85:14 86:17 88:24	32:24 36:13 37:1
167:9,13,17	payor 22:21 49:17	89:11,13 95:15,20	37:21 38:1 39:15
176:12 181:24	61:2,11 78:5	95:22 114:2,14	40:10 41:11,12,19
191:25 192:4,9	160:1,12 161:7,22	116:7 143:4	41:20,22,23 42:8
209:10	163:12 164:4	144:12 145:15	42:11 43:6,8,19
pass 11:7 99:19	181:24 192:10	156:16,17 160:9	50:5 51:17 74:25
patient 35:13 41:4	payors 65:14	160:19 162:10	103:14 106:22
57:4 60:10 63:8	97:11 157:10	164:5 187:9	114:8 116:24
63:18 65:4 90:21	158:2 159:14	188:17,18	117:7,16 119:24
91:1,4,13 93:3,11	160:20,22 161:10	periods 24:11	120:25 121:6,8,14
94:22 174:6 177:8	162:11,15 163:22	25:23 28:18,20	121:14,20 131:7
181:4	165:16 166:1	37:25 48:13,15	142:12,20 146:6
patients 36:25	167:9,17 176:12	64:6 67:5 96:19	152:23 169:22,22
78:18 119:22	192:1,4	permitted 175:4	170:7,10 171:18
121:9,20,25	pays 30:11 77:19	180:22 206:17	171:24 172:12
166:18	97:15	person 41:5	173:8 174:19
pause 176:25	pbm 41:2,3,7	personal 194:8,11	176:6
pay 30:15 63:22	180:7	perspective 60:24	pharmacist 91:15
67:13 68:7,14	pbms 40:24	64:10,18 65:2	93:10
70:11 78:12 79:18	pc 4:18 5:2	78:25 88:1 89:3	pharmacy 7:6
79:23 80:6,7,17,22	pending 203:12,17	89:22,24 90:15	11:18 13:7,11,21
80:23 81:2,5,13,13	pennsylvania 1:12	158:8,10 159:11	13:25 15:10 18:2
82:6,9,11,15 88:20	2:4 3:7,20 5:14	159:14 163:20,22	27:15 29:10 32:13
89:4 91:22 97:20	6:4	177:6,21,23 190:6	32:17 36:11 37:17
97:25 171:24	penny 134:7	pertains 168:5	37:19 38:23 39:10
paying 77:10,18	people 79:1 81:10	ph.d 8:5 207:19	41:7 43:2,13,13,13
78:11,22 79:1,1,6	81:12,17,17 82:5	210:5 211:2,24	43:18,22,23 44:6
79:9,19,24 80:24	percent 82:25	212:2,4,12	49:15,22 50:8,15
81:10,17,18,20,25	118:2	ph.d. 1:11 2:5 10:2	50:16,17 59:19
134:12		209:6	63:22 66:8 67:12

[pharmacy - pretty]

Page 27

68:13 74:21,22 79:14 83:16 89:4 91:12,17,22 92:12 94:22 97:18 98:4 98:9 99:14 142:23 144:14,15,15 153:5,6 158:22 166:19 167:13 168:25 169:6,7,8 169:18 170:25 172:9 175:23 177:11,12 178:9 178:10 179:14,15 179:15,23 180:4 180:11 181:12,25	pizzi 6:7 place 127:10 129:19,22 130:17 150:13 162:21 209:7 plaintiff 59:17 128:5 plaintiffs 2:10,14 2:19,25 27:8 36:9 36:16,18 37:8,15 38:22 39:7 45:1 45:18 51:5 100:7 113:9 122:16 188:3 plans 96:25 play 129:17 players 143:11 plaza 4:15 please 19:22 20:10 44:24 45:22 54:16 57:24,24 59:22 60:15 66:23 75:22 86:4 94:24 99:23 109:9 111:17 112:24 115:11 116:14,17 119:18 122:8,11 128:1 156:6 159:20 161:4 163:10 175:9 176:23,24 183:4 203:2,2 205:1 pleasure 101:15 102:18 plus 25:10 192:4 pocket 40:16 78:22 79:1 84:22 85:12,20 86:7,18 86:20 87:13 88:3	61:3,17 63:24 91:4,7 92:1 93:4 93:13 94:15 96:11 96:23 97:13,20 132:13,14 155:7 159:2,11 166:16 167:4,5 173:10,11 174:21 177:9,13 177:18,19 182:4 197:21 207:16 pointing 22:7 points 168:10 portion 15:1,3 30:15 portions 108:24 197:16 202:15 position 68:12 204:4 possession 203:9 possibility 165:24 possibly 141:5 176:4 203:23 post 182:4 potential 157:13 potentially 50:1 61:15 149:14 207:7 power 143:12 144:4,8,19 151:12 powerpoint 206:23 ppu 85:11 ppudt 136:25 137:12 practice 54:11 88:6 practices 53:20 194:13 pre 182:3 preceding 48:22	precise 189:17 precisely 94:5 prefer 28:7,7 premise 129:11 prepared 196:1 197:8 204:8 preparing 12:21 188:2 prescriber 40:5 prescribing 40:4 prescription 21:19 21:23 22:2 23:22 28:21 29:20 30:6 30:8,16 32:18,20 32:24 33:1 35:14 37:6 39:16,22 40:1,20 41:6,18 43:6 50:18 64:12 65:21 75:2 81:11 82:7,21,21,24 84:2 89:18 90:20 94:21 97:12 106:18 118:7 157:17 172:14 173:16 177:7 180:10 prescriptions 16:25 22:23 23:1 23:25 37:3,18,22 39:9 41:11 42:8 135:17 156:21 160:21 172:16 present 7:12 55:16 70:24 73:24 74:4 74:6,9 174:8 presented 184:13 185:8 preserve 69:1 preserved 133:20 205:24 pretty 143:13 153:11 196:20
--	---	---	--

prevent	74:6 175:7 204:15	137:21 145:3,11 199:1,1 200:2,10	157:11,12 158:17 160:18 161:22
previous	49:19 73:22 81:15 183:18	problem 87:19 155:4	164:19 166:1 167:10 174:20
previously	70:17 71:24 72:14 124:19 197:8	procedure 49:7 50:24	184:14 192:8 199:17
price	27:10 79:8 84:1,2 129:23 130:4 133:13,16 134:11,14 136:10 136:11,13 138:18 156:16 160:7,8 161:6,9,19,21 162:3,22 163:1,4 163:11 167:12	proceed 100:8 175:8	production 9:6 190:8
prices	137:20,20 137:23,23 138:22 138:22 145:14 162:9,17 167:9	process 31:17 65:13	products 1:3 22:15 24:12 27:9 27:22 28:14 48:4
primarily	11:17 16:19	procure 177:12	48:8,12 50:5
princeton	5:21	procurement 93:19,22	61:16 96:18 99:11 113:10,18 114:16
principles	153:13	procuring 175:24 178:10	116:22 117:4,11 118:14 119:2,8,21
prinston	3:8,14	produced 18:2 37:16 57:6 111:6 112:19 146:3 151:24 170:6 176:15 201:21 207:8,10	121:11,18,19,23 122:19 123:3,14 128:5 129:11,14 129:18,21 130:5 130:11,17 131:7 132:25 133:1,13
printing	93:8	producing 110:17 110:19	133:17 136:4 137:22 138:20,20
prior	87:4 116:9	product 19:17 22:16,16 23:19 25:6,7,11,20 26:20 26:20,24 27:9,20 34:20,21 35:5 38:12 40:13 48:7 48:16 50:9,13 64:8 79:8 80:22	142:9 145:3,14,18 145:20 146:7,13 147:8 152:14 157:14 158:1,12 159:15 160:9 161:12 163:23 165:17 167:5,14 173:7 176:7
private	51:20 99:12 103:21 187:4	84:23 85:3,3,13 88:2,24 89:6,11,12 92:7 95:14,19,21 99:3,4 105:23,24 112:12 120:11 125:11 129:4,5,8 135:25 136:7,8 149:18 151:18,20 152:11 156:16,17	186:12 187:5,12 187:15 190:6,12 190:14 194:4,6 professor 101:9 104:6
privately	30:2	profile 93:13	professor 101:9 104:6
privilege	125:12 206:25	profit 61:22 63:25 92:17 98:19 123:12 132:9	138:7,8 148:8 173:25 177:20 188:21
privileged	38:11 38:19 76:10		profited 48:3 129:20 131:6,10 173:21
privileges	112:12 125:12		profits 48:5 61:8 61:21 126:25
probably	34:16 49:5 52:14 121:21 121:22 123:17		129:12 135:9 139:9 140:5,8 141:2,4 169:17,22 173:23 175:23 176:7 177:2,11 178:8
programs			programs 24:21
proof			proper 123:25 127:12,18 128:9
propose			propose 126:23
proposed			proposed 108:7 124:14 139:25 148:25
proposing			proposing 115:24
prospective			prospective 157:9 158:8 159:13 190:5,18
prospectively			prospectively 143:4 153:1,3 163:21 164:1 167:18 192:11
protection			protection 46:19 56:15,24 58:12
protective			protective 70:4
provide			provide 30:13,13 30:20 31:14 84:19 161:3,5,23 163:2,7 163:10 167:25 177:15 200:19 203:18 204:21 208:2

[provided - really]

Page 29

provided 17:12 18:8,19 19:4,8 20:3 22:14 23:16 24:3,9 25:18,21 26:7,9 29:23 31:10,12,13,14 33:7 36:11,21,24 37:3,14,21 38:1,3 38:5 40:7,10,18 41:10 42:1,24 43:11,12,16,20 44:1 45:1,24 46:3 46:12,19,23 47:6 47:15 48:14 49:20 49:23 50:2,11 51:16,25 52:19 63:15 65:11 74:2 89:19 96:5 168:6 170:25 176:9,18 177:3,5,24 186:23 187:1 200:1 providing 162:25 163:1 167:12 proving 38:20 public 12:22 16:7 42:21,22 102:20 102:23 118:19 132:8 153:14 207:22 208:4 209:4 212:19 publicly 132:8 published 104:13 104:16 pull 109:7 198:8 pulled 101:4 purchase 79:8 123:7 133:16 151:16 172:10 173:3 purchased 80:22 133:13 135:3	purchaser 79:9 purchasers 79:19 79:19,24 80:7,24 81:21,25 131:15 131:16 purchases 77:10 77:18 78:11 79:7 92:12 116:24 117:6 158:7 purchasing 117:12 134:13 142:9 145:17 173:7 174:12 purely 89:24 90:15 purity 190:9 192:6 purposes 14:21 16:16 43:10 70:3 70:4 86:6 89:25 99:18 115:20 130:14,15 157:16 166:4 186:10 188:7,12 purview 69:13 71:2 put 181:5 200:12 200:17 203:8 putting 64:17 65:1 93:6,7 120:10 207:17 208:1	question 11:20 21:21 22:7,8,25 26:13,14,18 28:17 33:18,21 35:3 36:8,14 39:2,4,6 39:14 41:9,14 42:13 46:20,23 47:12 52:24 58:2 59:21 66:20,23 67:24 68:18,19 69:2,17 70:5 72:1 72:7,21 73:5,10 75:11 76:23 78:10 78:15 79:22 84:8 86:3 87:3 90:13 93:24 95:7 97:2 107:24 110:24 119:17 120:4 129:7 131:23 139:13,17 140:20 141:1,20 159:7 161:19 166:13 169:5 174:3 175:3 175:10,16,18 178:16,17,20,24 178:25 179:1,9 180:3,23 181:8,19 182:6,12,14 187:23 188:16 191:15 195:2,14 195:16,19 196:22 197:3,6,7 198:1 202:11,14 203:11 203:17,20,24 204:9	questioned 170:16 questioning 11:8,9 173:19 questions 9:12 11:11,17 77:3 87:4 100:15,17 140:13 152:4 155:9 156:1 161:25 167:25 188:7,12 189:22 206:17 quick 127:25 quite 30:4 187:22
			r r 2:1,12 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 209:1 211:3,3 rachel 2:16 ramifications 46:7 random 56:25 range 96:13,15,16 raspanti 6:2 reach 106:22 read 14:19,20,22 14:24,25 15:2,3 32:10 38:23 51:3 83:4,9 110:23 175:9 210:9 212:5 reading 19:17 ready 13:2 100:8 172:19 real 127:24 reallocation 70:22 really 22:17 69:2 70:22 77:4 82:8 82:24 98:18 108:22 117:19 118:23 122:14 125:17 129:17 130:4 143:11 145:9 146:10

[really - repackaged]

Page 30

149:1 166:13	154:19 155:17,19	reflected 37:18 57:6 169:16 174:5	relates 1:4 22:25 84:3 96:2
204:17	155:21 168:3,16	reflection 45:16 46:5	relating 14:3,14 15:9 16:15
realm 70:14	180:16 183:7,10	reflects 41:18	relative 93:12 151:7
reason 210:11	201:12,13,15,17	refund 71:21 72:10,15,16	release 154:10
211:6,9,12,15,18	202:14 203:3,8	refunds 165:15,25	relevant 24:25 26:23 27:10 28:18
211:21	205:9,19,24 206:1	regarding 12:5 46:6 55:7 67:16	28:21,22 35:18 47:22 48:15,16,16
reasonable 61:23	206:3,9 207:13,18	100:19 113:5 135:23 192:6	48:18 50:1 57:5 57:14 59:6 61:24
138:9	recorded 160:18 161:10,21	registered 37:5 regular 31:4	61:25 148:17 160:9,19 173:12 176:20
reasons 71:24	records 108:18 131:20 203:7	regulation 102:12 200:5	relied 17:11 24:10 127:14 192:17 193:21
rebate 141:8,9,14	redo 53:19	regulator 192:4 regulators 43:15	rely 16:14 17:8,10 24:8 49:14 127:11
141:17 142:24	reduce 132:20	reimbursed	remainder 47:19 47:20 82:11
166:24	refer 15:13 18:12 18:16 95:9 109:8 112:21 116:20 197:14 201:4	28:13,14 55:20,21 63:18 77:8 78:11 203:10 206:23	remember 12:16 51:19 84:12
rebates 61:4	reference 27:17	reimbursement	103:15 104:8 105:3 107:19
138:16,19 139:11	28:13,14 55:20,21	102:11 181:23	108:4 142:7 171:1
140:7,18,24 141:6	63:18 77:8 78:11	relabeled 30:2 51:21 99:11,15	remind 70:23
143:1,18 144:25	203:10 206:23	relabeling 105:22	remiss 108:13
145:4,19 148:15	referenced 18:1	relate 28:20 96:17 99:2,3	remove 89:20
148:18 166:8	28:1 77:23 172:23	related 20:20	removed 61:22 138:8 170:5,6,22 171:16,22
167:2,4	173:20 192:18 210:6	21:14 40:12 60:21 61:17 65:18 67:4	rena 1:11 2:5 8:5 10:2 207:19 209:6
rebazan 3:11	references 12:9	78:4 94:20 95:2 98:25 102:11	210:5 211:2,24 212:2,4,12
rebecca 3:11	referencing 59:13	103:21,23 104:25 105:21 106:3	rendering 114:23
reboot 132:3	referred 22:19	118:4,4 124:8,9 129:22 130:7	repackaged 30:2 99:11,14 187:4
recall 25:3,5 29:17	55:24 58:19 113:13	146:7 148:12 149:18,25 150:1	
29:25 33:11 56:5	referring 15:17,18	167:6 187:4,11,12 191:10 209:10	
116:12 164:3,20	27:14 59:11 78:12		
194:6	78:13 85:4 89:2 90:5,12 128:9 134:8 138:15 182:3		
recalled 27:22	refers 28:11 128:17		
48:9 163:16,23	reflect 60:7 168:16 169:21 199:19 206:9		
165:16,25			
recast 51:20			
receipt 210:18			
receive 180:23			
received 123:8			
136:14 176:10,11			
205:16			
receiving 167:24			
181:25			
record 11:3 18:9			
19:11 54:22 55:1			
70:1 75:25 76:3			
100:5,11 154:9,14			

repackager 51:19 164:8,12,18 165:13	reported 43:15 133:17	204:8	response 207:14
repeat 115:11 140:20 164:14,14 192:25	reporter 1:15,15 11:12 14:5,7 16:1 16:9 17:18 23:6 24:16 34:1 45:2	represent 11:16 19:10 29:6,9,13 49:18 60:9 71:21 72:10,23 155:7,25 162:8 168:24 169:17 183:13	responsibilities 181:5
replicated 201:24	57:11 59:20 64:4	representation 38:17	responsibility 174:6
report 8:5 12:3,8 12:10,17 15:5 20:19 25:2 27:7 27:18 28:12,13 32:3 33:15 44:7 47:25 48:22 51:3 51:25 52:5 54:1 55:8,12 60:5 61:7 62:8 72:17 75:18 77:7 83:4 88:22 93:21 94:2 103:3 107:17,18,23 108:2,6,19,20,25 109:7 110:21 112:21,22 115:21 116:15 117:23 118:21 127:25 132:10 155:10 156:2,25 157:22 159:21 160:6 161:1 162:7,21 163:1 166:20 169:14 170:3 171:6,23 173:6 174:13 181:6 184:13 185:8 192:19 193:12,17 196:10,14,16,24 197:9,17,17 198:25,25 200:4 200:12 201:3,9,25 202:16,21 203:9 203:14 204:20,23 206:22 207:19	66:21 67:17,19 71:8 75:8 77:11 77:15 80:13 81:23 91:5,8 96:14 97:22 100:16 101:1,2,17,20 104:15 105:7,13 107:10 110:18 112:17 113:20 114:19 115:10 120:19 121:4 125:1 128:12,23 129:12,15 130:1 131:24 132:15 135:13 138:11 140:19 141:25 153:16,19,21 158:4 162:13,16 164:13 165:6 167:20 169:2,4 170:8 171:13 178:1,21 182:22 182:25 185:18,21 193:13,18 194:18 194:23 199:10 204:22 205:1 206:5 208:3 209:4	rest 31:21 190:8 restated 94:6 restricted 1:8 result 163:16 164:20 166:11 209:11	
resulted 160:13	representatives 102:13 111:1,10	request 9:1,6 83:8 83:11 163:9	resume 54:19
retail 11:18 13:11	represented 22:17 37:20 38:7 110:16 192:9	require 99:7 135:1	retail 11:18 13:11
13:21,25 15:10 17:14 18:2 25:18 26:8 27:15 29:10 32:13,23 36:11 37:1,16,21 38:1,23 39:15 40:10 43:19 44:6 50:14 59:18 65:3 66:8 67:12 68:13 83:15 85:2 89:8 94:11 99:14 114:7 119:24 120:24 121:5,8,11 121:20 122:2,5 123:4 136:1,4 142:12,20,23 144:5,13,14,14,15 146:5 152:23 153:5,6 169:22 170:7,9,25 173:8 174:19 175:22 177:10 188:20	requirements 117:13 147:14 190:9	requires 59:25 69:2 79:7 103:2 139:13	retailer 8:3 13:7 15:8,14,18 17:10 17:11,24 18:6,18 19:17 20:4 21:20 22:1,12 23:4,11,16 23:23 26:15 28:25
178:1,21 182:22 182:25 185:18,21 193:13,18 194:18 194:23 199:10 204:22 205:1 206:5 208:3 209:4	resale 120:24	research 15:21 17:1,19 31:9 34:8 107:13,14	
reporting 118:19 153:13	researcher 16:19	respect 115:22 120:9 137:3 141:6 143:18 184:17	
reports 12:11 102:19,23 103:10 118:21 150:11 198:13,19 200:15 201:3,4,22 202:21	respectfully 80:15 139:14	respond 181:17 187:21 193:10	

CONFIDENTIAL

[retailer - satisfied]

Page 32

29:19,21 30:22	return 137:24	87:17 88:14 104:1	routinized 153:11
31:20 33:9,17	210:13,17	107:23 108:4,17	153:12,17,18,19
35:15 36:12,19	returned 138:18	109:22 110:4,8	153:22
37:17 39:8 40:23	reveal 76:9 180:24	112:7 117:24	row 81:24
41:2,15,23 42:7	revealed 201:22	118:11 119:4	rows 19:11
43:5 44:4 45:23	revenue 64:1	120:6 121:21	ruben 2:3,3 71:18
46:18 47:6,22	84:18,20,21 85:3,8	122:6,14 127:2	84:15 87:2 203:3
49:8,12,14,22 50:5	94:10 95:9 132:10	128:10 131:11	205:4,12,20
50:7,8,13,16 51:17	136:24 137:3,13	132:23 136:23	207:11 210:1,2
56:8,11 57:6	137:25 138:16,21	137:11,13,14	ruben's 73:9
60:25 61:8,12	148:9 149:5 151:6	145:1 146:25	rule 143:8
66:5,17,18 67:1	173:23 174:5	150:22,25 151:2,3	ruler 2:13
84:23 85:13 88:23	176:7 177:2	152:14 155:9	rules 123:24 124:8
89:12,25 90:4,10	revenues 12:6	156:25 157:21	125:5
90:16 91:22 94:16	48:6 49:18 65:20	159:3 161:16	running 195:3
95:14,17,20,21	103:13 126:25	162:5,12 169:19	s
103:13 134:10,16	127:19 132:7,7	169:23 170:7	s 2:1,21 3:1 4:1 5:1
143:19,19 144:25	135:14 136:15,18	172:22 173:22	6:1 7:1 8:1 198:20
145:6 146:3	140:24 142:17	177:25 179:16	211:3
169:14 171:17	144:3 147:25	181:6 185:15,17	safety 190:9
173:13 176:8	176:9	187:8,14 195:25	sagoldberg 3:3
retailers 12:6,12	review 11:23 12:2	197:2 205:7	sale 28:21 32:23
12:18 14:17 21:14	13:1,10 110:25	ringing 91:13	43:1 48:4,5 60:22
22:14,18 27:21	111:5,9,25 146:2	rite 5:10 11:16	61:3,9,17 91:4,7
33:7 48:2,3,7,15	151:22 202:5	41:19	92:1 93:4,14
52:19 58:10 59:3	210:7	road 5:20	94:15 96:11,23
61:13 66:25 73:13	reviewed 13:6,17	rockett 6:18	97:13,20 134:10
74:1,8,10,14 75:1	13:19 14:2,13	rockett.shevon	158:12 166:16
89:16 95:24 96:3	15:10 16:15 41:24	6:19	167:4 169:18
99:12 103:7 123:8	102:24 109:25	role 101:9,14	173:11,11,22
126:7 131:1,5	110:3	102:5,17 106:25	174:21 177:18,19
133:5,11 136:6	reviewing 13:5	107:5 120:9	182:4
143:15 173:21	102:19	roles 107:3	sales 30:10 118:3
176:14,17 177:3	rgeman 2:17	rooney 4:18 5:2	118:19,21 133:21
177:14,15,21,23	right 21:8,16 28:8	rose 4:8	134:9 158:23
186:17	41:5,16,25 42:2	roseland 2:9	160:15,18 166:10
retrospective	44:13 46:2 47:17	ross 4:11	sample 110:9,12
190:19	54:9 55:25 57:1	roszel 5:20	sanger 2:11
retrospectively	58:21 62:7,23,25	roughly 160:13	sas 24:15,17,18,21
96:10 190:13,22	62:25 73:9,12	routinely 107:2	satisfied 67:11
	78:21 79:21 83:11		

satisfies 71:11	see 19:12,21 20:9	september 198:14	short 54:23 76:1
saying 23:10 47:12	20:18 21:7 24:22	series 21:13	100:6 103:23
55:7,10 57:20	27:25 31:12,13	served 168:10,16	183:8 195:3
88:1 91:25 143:25	42:22 55:19 57:2	service 149:12	shorthand 209:3,8
161:16 185:7	77:13,24,24 85:1	serving 168:8	show 170:2 197:24
204:15 205:3	88:25 89:8,25	199:6,11,13	198:5
says 35:9 73:11	90:16 93:21	set 50:7 113:3	shown 106:3
79:21 80:21 85:17	108:23 109:18	139:10 140:6	132:11
95:9 133:8 136:23	110:9 111:18,20	160:10 179:14	shuffling 105:14
149:22 173:21	112:4 113:14	180:7 189:17	side 93:11,13
198:19	117:1 122:3,20	209:13	148:9,9 149:12
schneider 14:4,6	128:2,7 130:25	seta 24:22	200:13,13
14:15	133:7 136:25	seth 3:3 11:5	sided 142:7
sciegen 6:16	138:6 152:2 155:3	206:13	sign 106:5 210:12
sciences 199:15	159:25 160:2	sets 180:5	signature 209:16
scope 60:5 67:21	174:11 195:3	setting 23:17	signed 210:20
70:19 71:2,12	200:16,21	144:6 179:25	significant 36:20
86:24 139:15	seeing 161:20	settled 166:5	114:15 143:12
187:20	seen 131:21	settlement 166:4	144:4,8 151:21
screen 18:9 28:5	133:22,25 134:2	seven 97:8	155:14 163:19
104:20,23 106:7	146:5,12 150:1	share 104:20,23	172:13
133:24 200:18	152:3,6 202:4	106:7 133:24	significantly
script 35:15	sell 114:2 119:8,21	151:7	144:13
scripts 4:17 34:3	119:24 121:9	shared 104:20,22	signing 143:14
42:5 168:24	131:15 133:1,14	105:4	similar 104:11
scroll 19:20 45:22	sellers 75:2	shareholder 12:11	similarly 116:10
second 19:24	selling 134:15	102:19 103:3,9	simple 23:17
26:11 32:10 44:23	142:11	118:20	35:19 53:9 54:2
44:23 109:13,19	sells 92:14	shareholders	110:24 129:7
110:10 116:21	sense 24:13 192:11	150:11 153:14	simply 26:22
156:7 157:1	sent 20:8 210:14	she'd 83:8	47:21 51:11 70:24
174:15 198:11,12	sentence 14:9 38:7	sheet 210:11	127:8 176:4
seconds 201:20	116:21 117:1	shelf 146:14	single 23:15 25:19
204:12	122:15 130:25	158:21	40:20 135:16
secrets 152:1	133:7 192:22	shevon 6:18	202:11
section 48:22	sentences 132:24	shield 8:6 197:9,12	sir 115:19 170:11
49:19 61:7 109:1	separate 59:6 72:7	197:18 198:14	171:2 172:3 173:1
109:18,19,22	94:1 150:8 185:16	199:22 202:16,22	173:5 176:2,23
111:19 123:11	195:19	207:20	179:20 181:19
security 199:9,16	separately 150:3	ship 121:2	188:17 190:23
	150:15		194:11 196:15,22

197:11	41:14 42:19 43:9	specialty	117:9,16
sitting	45:2 52:8,24	118:5 121:13	33:17 49:2
37:2 38:2 91:11	57:11 59:20 62:18	specific	15:9 18:13
158:21 178:5	66:21 71:16,18	18:16 20:21 25:23	20:15
size	72:1 75:8 77:11	26:24 30:10 50:20	st
sizes	77:12,21 78:16	61:16 64:2 81:11	4:16
slack	85:1 86:2 87:1	101:12 102:8	staff
slater	91:5 95:5 100:16	103:15 104:24	20:10,25
slaterdavis.com	104:15 105:13,18	105:11,21 113:24	22:14 26:15 30:23
2:12	107:25 108:12,16	114:3,3 116:7	30:25 31:4,22
slight	110:18,20 111:15	118:22 119:5	33:2,8,13,16 38:8
slightly	113:20 119:12	123:12 125:5	38:15 40:8 55:4
21:14 121:14	120:24 128:12	132:14,16 135:6	76:22 77:1 96:5
small	131:24 132:2	135:20 143:3	195:24
117:4 151:11	140:19 141:25	151:10 152:17	stamp
smolij	142:1 148:21	160:10 161:12	26:2 207:23
snippet	155:12 162:13	164:24 167:7	standard
software	164:13,21 165:9	184:11,14 185:3,9	1:13
solco	166:21 168:22	194:6 196:15	43:14 196:20
sold	169:2 170:15	197:7,20	standing
48:7 84:2,23 85:3	178:1 183:3	specifically	16:4
85:13 89:11 95:19	185:19 186:6	15:23	22:22
113:11,19,23	187:23 192:21	56:13 106:18	27:2
114:7,11 118:8,15	193:13 194:18	113:5 118:21	32:15
119:3 121:11,13	195:13 197:11	124:9 196:2	37:1
121:19,22,23,24	199:10 200:19	specifics	42:15
123:8 128:6	sort	152:15	20:23 22:15 23:20
131:17 135:3	51:11 53:5,9	196:25	25:21 26:21 27:7
138:20 145:13,21	53:17 54:9 79:24	spend	31:25 32:2,12,18
157:4 158:13	101:22 104:10,22	12:23 30:21	32:19 33:5,10,18
159:15 167:5	133:22,25 135:23	102:4	33:22 34:13 35:15
176:8 187:9	150:5 202:7	spending	40:15 44:22,25
188:19 190:14	sorting	22:14	46:6 47:22 50:14
solely	49:1	spent	50:15,17 51:4,6
solutions	sorts	15:22 30:23	56:25 58:21,25
105:14	27:4	30:25 31:2 68:22	59:2,6,19,23 60:8
194:20	183:20	71:21 72:11	74:2 123:21 124:2
sorry	south	101:13 106:16	124:2,2,7,8,17,22
14:10 16:1	3:6 5:8	107:7 108:5,11,19	124:23 125:5,8,21
17:18 18:15,24	speak	177:12 178:10	125:22 126:5,11
19:5 21:1,22 28:2	174:10	spoiled	174:7 181:5
35:1,1,10 36:15	180:15	spoke	184:11,14,17,18
	speaking	145:16	185:3,9 202:13
	165:7	spoken	
	special	76:13	
	14:3,14	spreadsheet	
	146:12,13,14	8:4	
		18:7,19 19:11	
		21:20 22:11 23:3	

[state - take]

Page 35

203:23	stoy 6:3	sum 47:21 50:12	surmised 34:16
stated 70:17 71:24	strategy 12:25	57:3 58:12 63:1	suspect 34:11
72:14	103:2	69:23	switch 118:25
statement 35:3	street 2:4,17,24	summary 55:15	switching 150:23
68:17 131:9	3:6,13 4:20 5:4,8	summed 48:19	sworn 212:14
171:21 202:25	6:10,15,19 7:9	58:11 73:14 74:14	system 106:17
203:3	strength 192:6	sums 63:23	134:5 136:3
states 1:1 20:21	stretch 206:18	super 77:4	147:15
21:15 23:14 25:25	strike 13:18 36:1,8	supply 103:6,23	systems 135:1
33:3 45:23 48:17	67:6 170:3 178:3	106:20 114:18,20	t
50:20,23 51:15	179:8 204:14,17	117:9,17 120:1,10	t 3:12 5:13 8:1
52:17 53:4 54:4	striking 178:24	120:17 135:2	80:23 84:24 85:4
123:23 134:4,25	structure 141:14	136:5 142:13	85:14 88:24 89:11
135:2 165:13	141:17	145:21 172:16	89:13 95:15,20,22
184:3	structures 141:8	187:10,12,16	209:1,1 211:3,3
statistics 12:5,8,9	141:10 142:24	190:1,11 191:12	tab 81:15
stats 54:8	students 103:3	199:16,17	table 10:1 20:18
stay 109:16	study 104:5,11,12	support 175:22	20:19 21:7,9,11,11
stenotype 209:4	studying 13:1	177:16 178:7	21:12 45:24 46:19
steps 52:2 53:23	subcategory 22:16	179:6	47:3,6 55:20,21
53:25 54:4	subgroup 74:2	supports 177:10	56:8,12,17,19
steven 3:18	subheading 15:8	suppose 67:6,8	58:19,19 59:4,10
steven.hunchuck	15:14	supposed 180:24	59:12,14,14 62:21
3:19	subject 162:5,6	sure 15:15,16 19:1	63:1 66:3,4,8,10
stick 111:16	167:23	19:9,21 24:6 28:3	66:16,18 67:9
stipulations 9:9	submit 108:15	29:11 31:15 35:24	68:11 70:11,13
stocked 172:17,18	submitted 199:20	41:13 45:15 47:18	71:20 72:23 73:2
stocking 121:25	subscribed 212:14	48:25 54:18 55:9	73:12 74:3,6,9,15
stomping 27:2	subsequent 51:8	55:14 56:2,3,7	74:16 75:1 159:20
stop 74:14 154:3	subsequently 43:7	57:18,20 64:22	168:5 169:14,16
175:5 182:16	subset 78:13	66:20 68:24 77:5	171:19 174:1
205:7	113:10,17 114:11	82:3 87:22 104:3	tables 59:9 65:24
stopped 25:14	subtotal 51:11	109:14 115:12	73:24 74:19
27:4	subtract 50:3	122:12 134:17	take 44:20 48:13
storage 117:13	subtracted 174:19	136:16 137:9	54:16 75:21 80:13
store 150:5 173:17	subtraction	140:21 141:4,12	91:20 92:8 99:23
stored 172:23,25	177:16	144:17 155:6	106:8 120:18,19
stores 32:15	suggestion 20:14	160:15 162:21	120:21 121:1,25
172:13	suite 2:4,13 3:13	164:15 189:1,17	124:16 131:14
storing 129:25	4:5,11,15,20 5:4	193:1 201:13	158:14 164:25,25
	7:5,9		166:14 167:16

[take - third]

Page 36

178:5 183:4,4	tell 15:21 39:7	38:14 45:20 60:3	things 12:20,22
taken 1:11 22:20	54:7 81:19 97:17	67:19 69:7 70:3,6	57:25 81:7 87:17
54:23 61:14 63:23	102:16 103:24	73:22 82:14 83:2	87:19 90:6 134:20
76:1 100:6 154:15	126:9 157:10,12	84:15 91:8 93:17	137:16 147:13
173:13 183:8	160:11 162:2,22	99:20,21 100:1	149:7,20,24 150:5
203:15 207:22	174:8	101:24 119:18	150:17 167:2
209:6	tend 82:19 147:21	120:15 126:17	172:17 192:22
takes 92:5	153:11	127:21 128:24	201:6
talk 24:25 35:7	term 72:17 81:20	129:15 132:21	think 22:18,24
36:2 55:4 56:19	94:4 148:17 153:2	139:18 162:16	23:10,12 29:5
58:9 85:7 89:21	terminating	163:8 168:1	31:16 38:25 46:13
118:19 132:24	203:16	169:10 170:20	47:20 48:21 51:15
173:7 205:2	terms 17:6 22:5	174:18 175:19	53:8,9 55:8 56:1
talked 13:4 15:6	62:2 63:3 64:18	193:18 208:10	57:17 62:9,13
16:18 21:25 22:11	89:25 90:16 98:19	thanks 84:15	80:16,16 93:14
52:3 83:20 101:8	144:9,10,11 145:5	theoretical 60:24	98:14 99:22
103:7 106:15	145:12 151:6,7,16	64:10,17 65:1	103:11 104:5
129:3 152:19	153:4 164:5	86:9 88:1 89:3,22	105:9 107:4,17,18
160:5 170:4 184:8	testified 20:16	96:2 147:20	109:7 116:5
194:2,15,24	68:3 69:14 156:20	theoretically 65:9	117:25 119:23
talking 22:24 23:2	180:1,4 207:6	theories 21:10	126:18 128:21
23:2 32:14 34:22	testify 179:10	37:12 66:6 73:25	133:23 139:20
41:24 68:23 73:19	193:4	74:5,7,12,17 126:8	140:11,13 141:19
75:9 90:4 93:10	testimony 111:10	184:9	143:6,23 148:10
102:25 118:10	143:22,24 171:3	theory 49:12	148:16 149:24
121:16 139:23	180:22 190:24	50:21 58:25 59:2	150:23,24 152:18
142:17 170:14	192:25 193:2,9	61:10 64:15 65:16	154:2,4 159:12
174:22 178:2	199:20 210:9,18	88:6,6,7,9,20	163:3 176:4
188:8 198:16,17	212:8	90:12,14 128:11	182:18 185:5
199:22	teva 4:6 6:12	128:13 131:11,19	193:3 194:1 195:5
talks 118:7	69:22 103:11	167:1	195:7 199:2
tallied 181:4	118:18 183:13,14	therapeutic 191:4	200:25,25 201:8
teach 16:19	184:1 193:23	191:8,9,14	thinking 106:17
102:17 103:1	194:6,12 206:24	thereof 209:12	107:3
teaching 12:23	206:24	thing 15:20 46:18	third 22:21 49:17
tech 109:6 112:23	teva's 194:9	48:20 59:9 81:3	61:2,11 65:14
113:3 116:15	texas 2:13 4:11	96:3 118:23 128:1	80:20,21 97:11
122:8 130:21	text 205:15,16	146:18,21 148:14	157:10 158:1
technology 150:4	texted 205:14	149:11 173:9	159:14 160:22
telephone 39:20	thank 22:7 28:8	177:18 202:23	163:22 165:16
	34:25 35:11 36:6		167:9,13,17

[third - typically]

Page 37

176:12 181:24	187:8 188:17,18	total 35:13 50:12	treatise 177:9,13
191:25 192:4,9	195:3 199:3,4	57:4 58:6,9 67:4	177:15 178:7
thornburg 5:7	201:1,9,15 203:15	69:23 72:10 73:12	179:4,5
thought 108:8	204:5,6,14,23	74:13 82:22,23,25	trial 71:1
145:10 148:22	206:6,7 209:6	118:19 128:4	tried 204:9
176:22	210:19	181:4	triple 108:15
three 6:10 68:4	timeframe 157:5	totally 141:17	true 46:15 180:8
79:25 80:4,9 81:2	157:17 158:22	totals 47:21	191:24,25 209:7
81:7	210:8	touche 117:25	212:8
tiffany 4:3	timer 195:8	tpp 60:23	try 69:16 77:22
time 1:13 11:1,9	times 31:23,23	tpps 133:1	87:11 132:20
12:23 15:22 24:11	68:4 83:21 94:1	trace 134:3,4,22	183:21 197:4
24:25 25:23 26:9	94:16 95:20 97:8	135:1 147:15	trying 21:1 22:9
26:11,23 27:10,13	99:10 156:16	traced 136:2	24:5 48:24 51:2,4
27:20 28:16,18,20	160:7,8 161:20	track 134:3,4,6,21	53:2,10 78:9
28:22 30:16,21,23	163:2 184:9 197:1	134:25 135:11	93:18 95:4 102:4
30:25 31:1,2,3,24	timestamp 40:1	136:7,11 147:14	122:12 171:5
35:17,18 37:25	title 120:21 121:1	147:14 150:10	182:14,14 189:14
48:13,15 54:20,24	123:3 131:14	trade 5:4 121:12	192:24 203:12
57:5,14 64:6,9	titled 207:18	122:2,3,5 123:5	turn 15:4 159:20
67:5 75:24 76:2	today 11:21 33:14	136:1,5 188:21	169:13 207:15,15
80:14,23 84:24	76:6 79:5 104:5	traded 132:9	turned 26:15
85:4,14 86:17	155:9 156:20	trailed 100:17	two 20:15 21:10
88:24 89:11,13	178:6	trained 51:23 54:3	53:3 55:23 80:8
91:15 95:15,20,22	today's 11:25	transaction 43:12	87:17,19 108:6,9,9
96:19,20 98:10	told 26:18 53:25	96:19 104:24	108:11 137:12
99:19,22 100:3,9	58:1 108:13 112:9	105:4 127:9 135:9	142:7,21 153:3,25
101:13 102:4	114:22,24 127:12	135:15 137:19,20	162:23 186:1
107:8 108:5,14,19	195:10	143:3 167:7	type 23:4,7 34:15
108:25 114:2,14	ton 39:16	transactions 23:13	96:18 118:21
143:7 144:12	tons 37:2	26:1 105:18,20	142:9,14 149:3
145:15,24 151:18	top 19:16 64:14	114:6 179:21	150:2 151:18,20
151:19 152:19,24	75:9,14 103:19,25	182:4	152:10
154:3,4,12,17	108:12 110:14	transcript 210:6	types 78:5,5,25
155:16,20 156:15	111:2,4 116:12	210:20 212:5,8	96:18 105:24
156:16,17 158:2,6	134:25 148:3	transcription	135:3,4 145:14
159:2,3,11 160:9	164:10 207:24	209:7	146:14 152:21
160:19 162:10	topic 195:4	transparency	typically 12:21
164:5 165:7 167:6	topics 75:19	192:10	96:10 98:15 152:8
168:1,14 172:24	torrent 69:22	traurig 4:2 183:2	152:25 179:14
174:25 183:6,9			180:7

CONFIDENTIAL

[u.s. - vary]

Page 38

u			
u.s. 3:9,9,15,15	141:7 142:22,25	united 1:1 23:14	72:16 96:20 98:4
30:4 37:7 75:3	159:5 164:22	25:25 135:2	176:2 204:10
102:21 114:1	169:1 174:1,4	165:13	usually 23:21 40:5
118:3 124:5	178:13 179:13	units 89:10 95:19	63:22 97:19 98:17
135:18 136:1	180:13 181:8,18	105:5 118:7 135:3	117:13,15 120:23
153:11 158:13	182:13 186:5	135:17 137:19,20	147:4,24 150:1,14
164:7 172:16	187:23 189:14	147:7,11,13,18,21	
188:21	192:16 193:1	147:24,24	v
uh 63:7 85:6	196:6	universe 37:4	v 210:4 211:1
185:21	understanding	40:19	212:1
ulmer 7:8	17:13,25 18:4	university 15:24	valsartan 1:2
ulmer.com 7:9	22:13 25:2 26:6	16:4,12	24:11 27:9,20,22
ultimate 67:16,17	29:7 40:9 61:8	unjust 20:5,13,17	48:4,6,8 50:9 57:5
139:13	69:10 92:2 96:9	21:5,12 27:19	71:22 72:12 78:19
ultimately 106:22	96:12 101:13	47:6 48:3,18 49:9	85:23 86:10 92:11
158:13 166:3	121:10 122:22	49:13 50:22 58:5	99:15 113:10
undergrads 54:8	127:15 134:5,19	58:7,13 59:5,9,17	116:22 117:4
underlies 52:2	152:1,20 153:24	60:19 61:6,24	118:13 119:1
underlying 21:11	166:2 172:13,22	62:20 63:24 64:11	121:19,22,23
26:17 52:13,15	179:20 180:6,9	64:24 65:19 74:9	122:19 128:5
163:5	184:21 185:23	84:4,11 115:17,24	131:7 135:24
underneath 52:13	understood 17:22	116:5,11 122:18	157:4,18 158:20
95:13	168:15 190:20,22	122:22 123:19,21	163:16 166:10
understand 11:21	193:3	123:24 124:10,15	169:19 173:22
15:17 19:2 21:2	uniform 143:13	125:23 126:1,24	186:21 187:9
21:21 23:10 24:6	uninsured 77:10	127:5,8,13,16,18	188:13,19 190:2
29:5 36:14 39:4	77:17 78:11,18	128:11,14 129:3,9	191:3,18 193:5,22
39:13 41:8 42:13	79:6,9 81:11,20,24	130:10 131:12	194:9 210:4 211:1
42:14,14,19 46:2	92:14	133:3,10 149:13	212:1
47:18 48:25 51:4	unit 11:2 54:21,25	169:14,16 171:8	value 129:4,5,7,21
53:2,10 55:8,25	84:22 85:12,21	171:17 184:10	191:4,5,8,9,14,19
56:3,7 57:18,20,22	86:8 87:13 88:3	unpure 166:11	191:24 192:12
58:2 66:3 67:23	89:12 90:19 91:4	unseemly 204:17	vanaskie 14:4,15
71:25 77:6,22	91:16 94:16,17	untethered 87:3,7	variable 25:21
78:15 80:12 86:3	95:21 100:10	upbeat 183:23	81:8
86:25 93:19 94:8	129:24 134:7,25	updated 199:18	variations 144:24
95:5,6 97:1,2 99:1	135:12,12,13	upstream 43:24	varied 167:10
102:4 107:2,24	136:9 146:23	150:25 151:16	variety 145:12
124:7,11 127:7	147:1,9,22,23	153:1,25 187:5	199:24
134:18 137:8	150:13 154:13,18	use 23:3,6 50:15	various 102:11
		50:17 55:9 56:2	vary 21:14 124:1
			150:20 153:4

CONFIDENTIAL

[varying - wholesalers]

Page 39

varying 50:23	148:21 159:2	192:25 201:5,11	whitney 6:18
verdict 69:5	waive 208:4	205:24 206:3	wholesale 104:22
verify 210:9	waived 206:24	wanted 13:5 19:9	145:19 152:13
veritext 1:10	waiver 76:11	26:12 37:11	164:23
210:14,23	112:13 125:13	110:24 146:18	wholesaler 89:5
veritext.com	walgreens 15:23	168:15 195:4	101:12 102:12,14
210:15	15:24,24 16:2,3,7	203:13	104:11,11,19
version 51:6,8	16:15,21 42:5,16	wants 132:3	105:23 110:16
versions 134:3	75:1 104:6,7,12	warehouse 120:23	111:1 119:3
185:17,25 188:13	172:15,24,25	121:3 172:18,24	122:18 129:17
versus 8:6 22:3,3	173:3	172:25	135:8 136:24
60:19 125:22	walk 176:3	warranty 45:24	139:10 140:4
144:25 163:23,25	walked 206:10	washington 3:13	141:9,14,16 142:5
197:9,13,18	wallack 5:17	4:20 5:14	144:22 146:2
198:15 199:23	155:24	way 2:13 19:21	147:4,13 149:19
202:17 207:20	walmart 42:5,16	43:25 69:3,18	150:25 151:12
vial 90:25 91:10	75:1	70:21 81:18 98:21	152:4,16
93:6	walnut 7:9	124:16 138:5	wholesaler's
video 11:6	walsh 6:7,9	146:12 159:13	101:14
videographer 7:14	walshlaw.com 6:8	164:3 165:19	wholesalers 12:6
11:1 54:20,24	6:9	166:8 172:18	12:12 100:20
75:24 76:2 100:3	want 11:10 15:4	198:1 205:5,7	102:5,15,17,20
100:9 132:18	15:16 20:24 21:4	209:11	103:6 104:18
154:12,17 155:16	24:25 27:6,12	ways 92:22 133:9	106:6,14,25 107:8
155:20 183:6,9	29:2,6 34:17 35:7	we've 46:13 103:7	108:7 113:5,13,24
201:11,14	35:25 36:2 38:18	140:11 186:17	113:25 114:3,12
videotaped 1:10	38:20 44:2,18	189:25 194:1	114:24 115:4,17
view 40:10 123:2	45:15 46:3 47:17	week 97:18	115:23 116:11,25
203:15	55:9 56:2,2,6,14	weekend 183:23	117:7 118:16
viewed 176:19	56:15,21 57:18,19	weird 14:8 72:2	119:7,21,25
violated 194:12	57:19 58:3 64:22	92:16	120:10,18 123:3
violation 199:20	66:2 68:25 73:11	went 21:19,24	123:13 124:16
virtual 1:10	75:17 77:5,22	53:25 97:17	125:25 126:2
vis 11:18,18	84:19 87:11,11	103:22 163:11	128:10,18 129:10
volume 145:17	88:21 89:20,20,24	181:2 204:4,5	129:18 130:5,10
148:16	90:15 111:24	west 4:5 5:4 6:19	130:16 131:13
	113:2,4 116:20	7:5	132:13,25 133:4
w	128:1 129:6,7	whereof 209:13	133:11,12,23
w 3:4,5	134:17 142:21	whiteley 2:20,21	134:1,6,12,22
wacker 4:5	162:20 168:13	whitely 38:9 39:11	135:11,18,21,22
wait 56:6,18 64:21	180:5 189:17		136:6 137:4 142:7
126:19 127:22			

[wholesalers - york]

Page 40

142:21 144:1	110:20 112:15,19	160:6 162:1	x
146:5 147:2 151:6	113:22 114:20	165:19	x 1:2,5 8:1
151:15,23 152:7	115:8,12 116:2	work 16:25 17:1	xi01658 209:17
152:22,23,25	119:12 120:15,21	31:18 34:8 38:11	xponent 81:9
wide 118:11,12	121:5 123:1 124:5	101:10,11 102:1	
william 5:17	124:20 125:2,15	103:21 104:14,17	y
wish 106:11 152:2	126:17 127:21	109:4 112:11	y'all 154:4
wished 202:20	128:13 129:16	125:11 152:5	yeah 15:20 27:25
wishes 206:19	130:2,14 132:1,16	207:13	28:2,7 33:19
withdraw 72:20	135:14 138:12	working 15:22	34:24 56:13 62:11
73:4 84:10 97:3	139:4,18 140:11	31:3,9 101:15	66:23 70:8 75:20
178:3,16,16 179:3	141:2,19 142:2	103:21 104:7,16	77:13 80:10 83:12
195:2 197:3,6	143:23 145:9	108:20,25	87:20 101:25
withdrawning	153:9,18,20,22	works 102:5	105:5 106:11
175:15,17 178:19	154:6,10 155:12	106:18 135:7	108:8 117:8 134:2
178:24	157:21 158:6	152:2	134:11 136:20
witness 2:5 11:7	159:10 162:15,17	world 65:17 68:7	142:5 143:23
14:8 16:3,11 17:4	165:10 167:21	68:8 69:19 70:8	147:3 154:6
17:19 18:12 19:20	168:1,22,25 169:3	72:2 86:9 92:16	156:11 159:24
23:9 24:18 27:1	169:6,10 170:11	152:2 192:14	165:1 187:22
32:6,9 34:2 38:13	171:14 172:2	206:19	196:5 201:8
38:14 39:13 45:4	174:18,24 175:5,9	worries 45:13	203:21 207:3
45:21 46:9 49:5	176:2 178:18,23	worry 109:17	year 22:16 23:20
52:8,23 53:15	179:19 180:18	worst 204:12	25:10,19 26:19
54:15 57:12 58:18	181:18 183:3	worthless 129:11	35:17 40:14 145:3
60:3,12,18 62:11	184:8,21 185:5,22	129:13 130:11	153:3,25 161:22
64:5 66:14 67:20	186:5 187:1,22	write 107:19,23	184:14
69:7 70:6 71:5,10	189:21 191:7	108:1 117:3	years 106:17
71:25 72:15 73:1	193:11,16 194:1	157:22,22 195:12	153:3 186:15
74:24 75:13 76:13	194:15 196:5	195:15,20	206:12
76:19 77:13,21	197:24 199:13	writing 107:8	yell 183:17
79:13 80:3 81:22	202:3,10,14,19,24	108:5	yeller 183:19
83:10,13,20 85:17	203:23 206:10,15	written 13:18	yesterday 13:4
86:2,14,25 87:15	207:6 209:6,13	127:11 198:19	14:18,23,25 16:19
87:20 88:13 90:3	210:8,10,12,19	wrong 56:4	20:16 29:23 58:1
90:19 91:6,9,25	witnesses 13:7,12	wrote 16:6,21	101:9 106:15
92:20 96:16 97:8	wmurtha 5:18	113:17 122:16	107:16,22 129:4
97:23 98:12,24	word 55:18 113:17	195:11,21 201:5	195:10
99:17,19,21 100:1	words 78:17 81:2		yield 69:3
101:19 104:17	82:20 131:2,3		york 2:18,18 6:20
105:8,17 107:11	143:7 157:24		6:20

[zhejiant - zooming]

Page 41

z
zhejiant 3:8,15
zhp 69:22
zmick 7:4
zoom 1:10
zooming 70:3

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 30

(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.

(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:

(A) to review the transcript or recording; and

(B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.

(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.